

DIODORUS SICULUS

BOOK I

A COMMENTARY

ÉTUDES PRÉLIMINAIRES AUX RELIGIONS ORIENTALES DANS L'EMPIRE ROMAIN

PUBLIÉES PAR
M. J. VERMASEREN

TOME VINGT-NEUVIÈME

ANNE BURTON
DIODORUS SICULUS
BOOK I
A COMMENTARY



LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL
1972



'Frontispiece to volume I of *Diodori Siculi Bibliothecae Historicae Libri qui supersunt* . . . recensuit Petrus Wesselingius . . . Amstelodami, 1746.'

ANNE BURTON

DIODORUS SICULUS

BOOK I

A COMMENTARY

WITH A FRONTISPIECE



LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL
1972

ISBN 90 04 03514 1

Copyright 1972 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, microfiche or any other means without written permission from the publisher

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Preface	VII
Bibliography	IX
Abbreviations	XXVIII
 The Sources for Book I	 I
Commentary	35
Index	29I

PREFACE

The present work is an adaptation of the doctoral thesis submitted to the University of Bristol in 1968. I should like to express my unbounded gratitude to Professor N. G. L. Hammond of the University of Bristol and to Dr. J. R. Harris, now Professor of Egyptology at Copenhagen, both of whom supervised my original research and have since provided unfailing help and useful advice. To Alan B. Lloyd of the University College of Swansea I offer my grateful thanks for reading the final draft and making a number of valuable suggestions. To the trustees of the Colston Research Fund I am indebted for a generous grant towards the cost of preparing the manuscript for publication.

ANNE BURTON

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aldred, C. "Hair Styles and History", *Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin*, XV, 1957, no. 6.
- Alliot, M. *Le Culte d'Horus à Edfou au temps des Ptolémées* (Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, Bibliothèque d'Étude XX), Cairo 1949 and 1954.
- Amélineau, E. *Géographie de l'Égypte à l'époque Copte*, Paris, 1893.
- Andebeau, C. "La légende du Lac Moeris", *Inst. d'Ég.*, XI, 1930, 105-127.
- Anonymous "Le papyrus juridique de Touna-el-Gebel", *Chron. d'Ég.*, XXI, 1946, 48-49.
- Anthes, R. "Affinity and Difference Between Egyptian and Greek Sculpture", *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 107, no. 1, 1963.
- Anthes, R. "Notes concerning the Great Corporation of Heliopolis", *JNES*, XIII, 1954, 191-192.
- Anthes, R. "Werkverfahren ägyptischer Bildhauer", *MDAIK*, X, 1941, 79-121.
- Astour, M. *Hellenosemitica, an Ethnic and Cultural Study in Western Semitic Impact on Mycenaean Greece*, Leiden, 1965.
- Baedeker, K. *Egypt and the Sudan*, 8th ed., 1929.
- Baikie, J. *Egyptian Antiquities in the Nile Valley*, London, 1932.
- Baker, H. S. *Furniture in the Ancient World*, London, 1966.
- Baldry, H. C. *The Unity of Mankind in Greek Thought*, Cambridge, 1965.
- Ball, J. *Egypt in the Classical Geographers*, Cairo, 1942.
- Barber, G. L. *The Historian Ephorus*, Cambridge, 1935.
- Bataille, A. *Les Inscriptions Grecques du temple de Hatshepsout à Deir-el-Bahari* (Publications de la Société Fouad I de Papyrologie; Textes et documents no. 10), Cairo, 1951.
- Bataille, A. *Les Memnonia*, Cairo, 1952.
- Bates, O. *The Eastern Libyans*, London, 1914.
- Baumgartel, E. J. *The Cultures of Prehistoric Egypt*, 2nd ed. rev., London, 1955.
- Beekman, W. *Boerhave Hout in Alle Tijden*, Deventer, 1949.
- Bell, H. Idris "Brother and Sister Marriage in Graeco-Roman Egypt", *RIDA*, II 1, 1949, 83-92.
- Bell, H. Idris *Cults and Creeds in Graeco-Roman Egypt* (Liverpool Monographs in Archaeology and Oriental Studies), 3rd imp., Liverpool, 1957.
- Bérard, J. "Les Hyksos et la légende d'Io", *Syria*, XXIX, 1952, 1-43.

- Bergman, J. *Ich bin Isis* (Acta Univ. Uppsala: Historia Religionum no. 3), Uppsala, 1968.
- Bevan, E. R. *A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty* (*History of Egypt*, vol. IV, ed. Petrie), London, 1927.
- Bickerman, E. *Chronology of the Ancient World*, London, 1968.
- Bissing, F. W. von *Ägyptische Kunstgeschichte*, Berlin, 1934.
- Bissing, F. W. von "Il culto dei Dioscuri in Egitto", *Aegyptus*, XXXIII, 1953, 347-357.
- Bissing, F. W. von *Denkmäler ägyptischen Sculptur*, Munich, 1914.
- Blackman, A. M. "The House of the Morning", *JEA*, V, 1918, 149-165.
- Blackman, A. M. "Oracles in Ancient Egypt", *JEA*, XI, 249-255.
- Blackman, A. M. "Sequence of the Episodes in the Egyptian Daily Temple Liturgy", *Journal of the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society*, 1918-1919, 27-53.
- Blackman, A. M. and Fairman, H. W. "The Myth of Horus at Edfu", *JEA*, XXI, 1935, 26-36; XXVIII, 1942, 32-38; XXIX, 1943, 2-36; XXX, 1944, 5-22.
- Bleeker, C. J. *Egyptian Festivals, Enactments of Religious Renewal* (Studies in the History of Religions XIII), Leiden, 1967.
- Blümel, C. *Griechische Bildhauer an der Arbeit*, Berlin, 1943.
- Boardman, J. *The Greeks Overseas*, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1964.
- Boll, F. J. *Griechische Kalender* (Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie, 1910, no. 16), Heidelberg, 1910-1914.
- Bonneau, D. *La crue du Nil*, Paris, 1964.
- Bonnet, H. *Reallexikon der ägyptische Religionsgeschichte*, Berlin, 1952.
- Borchardt, L. *Allerhand Kleinigkeiten*, Leipzig, 1933.
- Borchardt, L. *Grabdenkmal des Königs Ne-user-Rē*, Leipzig, 1907.
- Borchardt, L. *Nilmesser und Nilstandsmerken*, Berlin, 1915.
- Borchardt, L. *Statuen und Statuetten von Königen und Privatleuten im Museum von Kairo*, Cat. Caire, Berlin, 1911-36.
- Boreux, C. *L'Art de la navigation en Égypte jusqu'à la fin de l'ancien Empire* (Études de Nautique Égyptienne), Cairo, 1955.
- Bouché-Leclercq, A. *Histoire des Lagides*, Paris, 1903-1907.
- Bowersock, G. W. *Augustus and the Greek World*, Oxford, 1965.
- Boylan, P. *Thoth the Hermes of Egypt*, Oxford, 1922.
- Breasted, J. H. *Ancient Records of Egypt*, Chicago, 1906-1907.
- Breasted, J. H. *The Battle of Kadesh* (Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago), Chicago, 1904.
- Breasted, J. H. *The Development of Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt*, New York, 1912.

- Brugsch, H. K. *Dictionnaire géographique de l'ancienne Égypte*, Leipzig, 1829.
- Brugsch, H. K. "Ein Decret Ptolemaios des Sohnes Lagi des Satrapen", *ZÄS*, IX, 1871, 1-13.
- Brugsch, H. K. *Hieroglyphisch-demotisches Wörterbuch*, Leipzig, 1867-1882.
- Brundage, W. "Herakles the Levantine", *JNES*, XVII, 1958, 225-236.
- Brunner, H. *Altägyptische Erziehung*, Wiesbaden, 1957.
- Brunner-Traut, E. "Spitzmaus und Ichneumon als Tiere des Sonnengottes", *Göttinger Vorträge vom ägyptologischen Kolloquium der Akademie*, 25-26 August 1964, 123-164.
- Bruns, G. *Der Obelisk und seine Basis auf dem Hippodrom zu Konstantinopel*, Istanbul, 1935.
- Buck, A. de *The Egyptian Coffin Texts* (Univ. of Chicago Oriental Institute Publications), Chicago, 1935-1956.
- Buck, A. de "The Judicial Papyrus of Turin", *JEA*, XXIII, 1937, 152-164.
- Budge, E. A. Wallis *The Book of the Dead*, 2nd ed., London, 1909.
- Budge, E. A. Wallis *The Mummy*, 2nd ed., London, 1925.
- Budge, E. A. Wallis *Osiris and the Egyptian Resurrection*, London, 1911.
- Budge, E. A. Wallis *The Papyrus of Ani*, London, 1913.
- Bury, J. B. *History of Greece*, 3rd ed., London, 1951.
- Camino, R. A. *Late Egyptian Miscellanies* (Brown Egyptological Studies, 1), Oxford, 1954.
- Capart, J. *Une rue de tombeaux à Saqqarah*, Brussels, 1907.
- Capelle, W. "Das Problem der Urzeugung bei Aristoteles und Theophrast", *Rhein. Mus.*, LXXXVIII, 1955, 150-180.
- Carter, H. and Mace, A. C. *The Tomb of Tut-ankh-Amen*, London, 1923-1933.
- Case, H. and Payne, J. C. "The Decorated Tomb at Hierakonpolis", *JEA*, XLVIII, 1962, 5-18.
- Casson, S. *The Techniques of Early Greek Sculpture*, Oxford, 1933.
- Caton-Thompson, G. and Gardner, E. *The Desert Fayum*, London, 1934.
- Caton-Thompson, G. and Gardner, E. "Recent Work on the Problem of Lake Moeris", *Geographical Journal*, LXXIII, no. 1, 1929.
- Černý, J. *Ancient Egyptian Religion*, Hutchinson's University Library, London, 1952.
- Černý, J. "Consanguineous Marriage in Pharaonic Egypt", *JEA*, XL, 1954, 23-29.
- Černý, J. "Egyptian Oracles", in Parker, R. A., *A Saite Oracle Papyrus in the Brooklyn Museum*, p. 35-48.
- Černý, J. *Mélanges Maspero*, I i (Mém. Inst. Franç. d'Arch. Or.), Cairo, 1934-1938.

- Černý, J. "Quelques ostraca hiératiques inédits de Thèbes au Musée du Caire", *ASAE*, XXVII, 1927, 183-210.
- Černý, J. "Stolen Property in Ramesside Times", *JEA*, XXIII, 1937, 186-189.
- Chassinat, E. "La mise à mort rituelle d'Apis", *Rec. Trav.*, XXXVIII, 1916, 33-60.
- Chassinat, E. *Le temple d'Edfou*, Paris and Cairo, 1892-1934.
- Clark, R. T. Rundle *Myth and Symbol in Ancient Egypt*, London, 1959.
- Clarke, S. and Engelbach, R. *Ancient Egyptian Masonry*, London, 1930.
- Clédat, J. "Notes sur l'isthme de Suez", *BIFAO*, XXI, 1923, 145-187; XXII, 1923, 135-189.
- Cole, T. *Democritus and the Sources of Greek Anthropology*, Hartford, Conn., 1967.
- Cook, A. B. *Zeus, a Study in Religion*, Cambridge, 1914-1940.
- Cornford, F. M. *Principium Sapientiae, the Origins of Greek Philosophical Thought*, Cambridge, 1952.
- Cumont, F. *Astrology and Religion among the Greeks and Romans*, London, 1912.
- Cumont, F. *L'Égypte des Astrologues* (Fondation Égyptologique Reine Élisabeth), Brussels, 1937.
- Cumont, F. *Les religions orientales dans la paganisme romaine*, 4th ed., Paris, 1929.
- Daressy, G. *Statues des Divinités* (Cat. Caire), Cairo, 1901.
- Daressy, G. "Stèle de l'an III d'Amasis", *Rec. Trav.*, XXII, 1900, 2-3.
- Daressy, G. "L'Égypte céleste", *BIFAO*, XII, 1916, 1-34.
- Daressy, G. "Hymne à Khnoum du temple d'Esnéh", *Rec. Trav.*, XXVII, 1905, 187-193.
- Davies, N. de G. *Rock Tombs of Sheikh Saïd* (Arch. Survey of Egypt, publ. by Egypt Exploration Fund), London, 1901.
- Davies, N. de G. *The Tomb of Rekh-mi-Rē at Thebes*, New York, 1943.
- Davies, N. de G. "The Town House in Ancient Egypt", *Metro-politan Museum Studies*, I 2, 1929, 233-255.
- Davis, T. M. *The Tomb of Iouiya and Touiyou*, London, 1907.
- Dawson, W. R. "The Mouse in Egyptian and Later Medicine", *JEA*, X, 1924, 83-86.
- Dawson, W. R. "The Origin of the Name Kiki", *Aegyptus*, X, 1929, 47-72.
- Derchain, P. "Le Papyrus Salt, 825", *Acad. Royale de Belgique Mém.*, LVIII, 1a, 1965.
- Derchain, P. "Le tombeau d'Osymandyas et la maison de la vie à Thèbes", *Göttinger Vorträge vom ägyptologischen Kolloquium der Akademie*, 25-26 August 1964, 165-171.

- Desroches-Noblecourt, C. "Un petit monument commémoratif du roi athlète", *Rev. d'Ég.*, VII, 1950, 37-46.
- Diels, H. *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, 6th ed. rev. Kranz, Berlin, 1951-1952.
- Dittenberger, G. *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae*, Lipsiae, 1898-1905.
- Dodds, E. R. *Euripides' Bacchae*, Oxford, 1960.
- Dodds, E. R. *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Sather Classical Lectures, 25), Univ. of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1951.
- Drioton, E. and Vandier, J. *Les peuples de l'orient méditerranéen*, Vol. II, L'Égypte, 4th rev. ed., Paris, 1962.
- Edgerton, W. F. "The Government and the Governed in the Egyptian Empire", *JNES*, VI, 1947, 152-160.
- Edgerton, W. F. "The Nauri Decree of Seti I", *JNES*, VI, 1947, 219-230.
- Edgerton, W. F. *Notes on Egyptian Marriage* (Studies in Anc. Oriental Civilisation, I i), Chicago, 1931.
- Edwards, I. E. S. *The Pyramids of Egypt*, Penguin Books, West Drayton, New York, 1947.
- Elgood, P. G. *The Later Dynasties of Egypt*, Oxford, 1951.
- Emery, W. B. *Archaic Egypt*, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1961.
- Engelbach, R. and Derry, D. E. "Mummification", *ASAE*, XLI, 1942, 233-265.
- English, P. T. "Cushites, Colchians and Khazars", *JNES*, XVIII, 1959, 49-53.
- Erman, A. *Ägypten und ägyptisches Leben im Altertum*, Tübingen, 1923.
- Erman, A. *Die Religion der Ägypter*, Berlin, 1934.
- Erman, A. *Zur Erklärung des Pap. Harris* (Berl. Akad. Sb.), Berlin, 1903.
- Erman, A. "Zu den Inschriften des Hr-hwf", *ZAS*, XXX, 1892, 78-83.
- Fakhry, A. "A note on the tomb of Khernef at Thebes", *ASAE*, XLII, 1943, 449-508.
- Fairman, H. W. "The Kingship Rituals of Egypt", in *Myth' Ritual and Kingship*, ed. Hooke, S. H., Oxford, 1958.
- Fairman, H. W. "Worship and Festivals in an Egyptian Temple", *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, Vol. XXXVII, no. 1, Sept. 1954, 165-203.
- Farnell, L. R. *Cults of the Greek City States*, Oxford, 1896-1909.
- Faulkner, R. O. "The Bremner-Rhind Papyrus I", *JEA*, XXII, 1936, 121-140.
- Faulkner, R. O. "The Cannibal Hymn from the Pyramid Texts", *JEA*, X, 1924, 97-103.
- Faulkner, R. O. "Egyptian Military Organization", *JEA*, XXXIX, 1953, 32-47.

- Faulkner, R. O. "Egyptian Seagoing Ships", *JEA*, XXVI, 1940, 3-9.
- Faulkner, R. O. "Installation of a Vizir", *JEA*, XLI, 1955, 18-29.
- Faulkner, R. O. *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts*, Oxford, 1970.
- Favre, S. *L'Arte e lo Sport nell'Antico Egitto*, 3rd ed., Massa-Carrara, 1965.
- Festugière, A.-J. *Personal Religion among the Greeks*, (Sather Classical Lectures, 26), Univ. of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1954.
- Forbes, R. J. *Studies in Ancient Technology*, II, III, Leiden 1955.
- Foucart, P. F. *Les Mystères d'Éleusis*, Paris, 1914.
- Foucart, P. F. "Un temple flottant, le vaisseau d'or d'Amon-Ra", *Monuments et Mémoires* (Piot), XXV.
- Frankfort, H. *Ancient Egyptian Religion*, New York, 1948.
- Frankfort, H. *Kingship and the Gods*, Chicago, 1948.
- Fraser, P. M. "Two Studies on the Cult of Sarapis in the Hellenistic World", *Opuscula Atheniensia*, III, 1960, 1-54.
- Fraser, P. M. "Current Problems Concerning the Early History of the Cult of Sarapis", *Opuscula Atheniensia*, VII, 1967, 23-45.
- Frazer, J. G. *Myths of the Origin of Fire*, London, 1930.
- Gadd, C. J. *Ideas of Divine Rule in the Ancient East* (Schweich Lectures of the British Academy), 1945.
- Gaillard, C. "Les animaux consacrés à la divinité de l'ancienne Lycopolis", *ASAE*, XXVII, 1927, 33-42.
- Gardiner, A. H. *Admonitions of an Egyptian Sage*, Leipzig, 1909.
- Gardiner, A. H. *Ancient Egyptian Onomastica*, Oxford, 1947.
- Gardiner, A. H. Communication, in *JEA*, XLVI, 1960, 104.
- Gardiner, A. H. "The Defeat of the Hyksos by Kamose", *JEA*, III, 1916, 95-110.
- Gardiner, A. H. *Egypt of the Pharaohs*, Oxford, 1961.
- Gardiner, A. H. *Egyptian Grammar*, 3rd ed., London, 1957.
- Gardiner, A. H. *Facsimiles of Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum, Chester Beatty ser. III*, London, 1910.
- Gardiner, A. H. "Four Papyri of the XVIIIth Dyn. from Kahun", *ZAS*, XLIII, 1906, 27-47.
- Gardiner, A. H. "The House of Life", *JEA*, XXIV, 1938, 157-159.
- Gardiner, A. H. *The Inscription of Mes, Untersuchungen*, IV, 3, 1905.
- Gardiner, A. H. *The Kadesh Inscriptions of Ramesses II*, Oxford, 1960.
- Gardiner, A. H. "New Literary Works from Ancient Egypt", *JEA*, I, 1914, 100-106.
- Gardiner, A. H. *Notes on the Story of Sinuhe*, Paris, 1916.
- Gardiner, A. H. *The Tomb of Amenemhet* (Theban Tombs Series), London, 1915.

- Gardiner, A. H. "Tuthmosis III returns thanks to Amūn", *JEA*, XXXVIII, 1952, 6-23.
- Gauthier, H. *Dictionnaire des noms géographiques contenus dans les textes hiéroglyphiques*, Cairo, 1925-1927.
- Geytenbeek, A. C. van *Musonius Rufus and Greek Diatribe* (trans. Hijmans, B. L.), Assen, 1963.
- Ghalioungui, P. *Magic and Medical Science in Ancient Egypt*, London, 1963.
- Goodenough, E. R. *Jewish Symbols in the Graeco-Roman Period*, New York, 1953.
- Goossens, G. "Le tombeau d'Osymandyas", *Chron. d'Ég.*, XVII, 1942, 177-184.
- Gorringe, H. H. *Egyptian Obelisks*, New York, 1882.
- Grapow, H. *Untersuchungen über die altägyptischen medizinischen Papyri*, *Mitt. der Vorderasiatisch-ägyptischen Gesellschaft*, XL, no. 1, 1935; XLI, no. 2, 1936.
- Grapow, H. and others *Grundriss der Medizin der alten Ägypter*, Berlin, 1954.
- Griffith, F. Ll. "The Abydos Decree of Seti I at Nauri", *JEA*, XII, 1927, 193-208.
- Griffith, F. Ll. "Apotheosis by Drowning", *ZÄS*, XLVI, 1909, 132-134.
- Griffith, F. Ll. Communication, in *ZÄS*, XLVII, 1910, 162.
- Griffith, F. Ll. *Hieratic Papyri from Kahun and Gurob*, London, 1898.
- Griffith, F. Ll. "The Millingen Papyrus", *ZÄS*, XXXIV, 1896, 35-51.
- Griffith, F. Ll. Review, in *JEA*, III, 1916, 141-142.
- Griffith, F. Ll. *Stories of the High Priests of Memphis*, Oxford, 1900.
- Griffith, F. Ll. "The Teaching of Amenophis", *JEA*, XII, 1926, 191-231.
- Griffith, F. Ll. and Thompson, H. *Demotic Magical Papyrus of London and Leiden*, London, 1904-1909.
- Griffiths, J. Gwyn *The Conflict of Horus and Seth* (Liverpool Monographs in Arch. and Oriental Studies), Liverpool, 1960.
- Griffiths, J. Gwyn "Diodorus Siculus and the Myth of Osiris", *Man*, XL, 1948, 83-84.
- Griffiths, J. Gwyn "The Flight of the Gods before Typhon", *Hermes*, LXXXVIII, 1960, 374-376.
- Griffiths, J. Gwyn "Human Sacrifice in Egypt: the Classical Evidence", *ASAE*, XLVIII, 1948, 409-425.
- Griffiths, J. Gwyn *The Origins of Osiris*, Berlin, 1966.
- Griffiths, J. Gwyn *Plutarch, De Iside et Osiride*, Univ. of Wales, 1970.
- Griffiths, J. Gwyn "Shelley's 'Ozymandias' and Diodorus Siculus", *Modern Language Review*, XLIII, 1948, 80-84.

- Grinsell, L. V. "The Ferryman and his Fee", *Folk-Lore*, LXVIII, 1957, 257-269.
- Groff, W. *Les deux versions démotiques du décret de Canope*, Paris, 1888.
- Gruppe, O. *Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte*, Munich, 1906.
- Guthrie, W. K. C. *The Greeks and their Gods*, London, 1950.
- Guthrie, W. K. C. *In the Beginning*, London, 1957.
- Guthrie, W. K. C. *Orpheus and Greek Religion*, London, 1935.
- Gyles, M. F. *Pharaonic Policies and Administration* (James Sprunt Studies in History and Political Science, 41), Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1959.
- Habachi, L. "A Statue of Osiris made for Ankhefenamun", *ASAE*, XLVII, 1947, 261-282.
- Hall, H. R. *The Ancient History of the Near East*, New York, 1913.
- Hall, H. R. "Nitokris-Rhodopis", *JHS*, XXIV, 1904, 208-213.
- Hanke, R. "Beiträge zum Kanonproblem", *ZÄS*, LXXXIV, 1959, 113-119.
- Hari, R. *Horemheb et la reine Moutnedjemet*, Geneva, 1964.
- Harris, J. R. "Egypt", in *World Furniture*, ed. Hayward, H. *Lexicographical Studies in Ancient Egyptian Minerals*, Berlin, 1961.
- Harrison, J. E. *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, New York, 1921.
- Hayes, W. C. *A Papyrus of the Late Middle Kingdom in the Brooklyn Museum*, Brooklyn, 1955.
- Helck, W. *Untersuchungen zu Manetho und den ägyptischen Königslisten*, Untersuchungen, XVIII, Berlin, 1956.
- Hopfner, T. *Fontes Historiae Religionis Aegyptiacae*, Bonn, 1922-1925.
- Hopfner, T. *Der Tierkult der alten Ägypter* (Denkschriften Wien, Bd. 57, Abh. 2), Wien, 1913.
- Iversen, E. *Canon and Proportions in Egyptian Art*, London, 1955.
- Iversen, E. "The Canonical Tradition", in the new *Legacy of Egypt*, ed. Harris, J. R., Oxford, 1972.
- Iversen, E. "Diodorus' Account of the Egyptian Canon", *JEA*, LIV, 1968, 215-218.
- Iversen, E. "The Egyptian Origin of the Archaic Greek Canon", *MDAIK*, XV, 1957, 134-147.
- Iversen, E. *The Myth of Egypt and its Hieroglyphs in European Tradition*, Copenhagen, 1961.
- Iversen, E. *P. Carlsberg No. VII; Fragments of a Hieroglyphic Dictionary*, Copenhagen, 1958.
- Jacoby, F. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, Berlin and Leiden, 1923.

- Jacoby, F. *Das Marmor Parium*, Berlin, 1904.
- Jaeger, W. *The Theology of the Early Greek Philosophers* (Gifford Lectures, 1936), Oxford, 1947.
- James, T. G. H. *The Hekanakhte Papers*, New York, 1962.
- Jelinkova-Reymond, E. "Quelques recherches sur les réformes d'Amasis", *ASAE*, LIV, 1957, 251-274.
- Jéquier, G. *Considérations sur les religions égyptiennes*, Neuchâtel, 1946.
- Jéquier, G. "Matériaux pour servir à l'établissement d'un dictionnaire d'archéologie égyptienne", *BIFAO*, XIX, 1922.
- Jesi, F. "Bes e Sileno", *Aegyptus*, XLII, 1962, 257-275.
- Jesi, F. "Rapport sur les recherches relatives à quelques figurations du sacrifice humain dans l'Égypte pharaonique", *JNES*, XVII, 1958, 194-203.
- Johnson, A. C. *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome: II, Roman Egypt to the Reign of Diocletian*, Baltimore, 1936.
- Jonckheere, F. *Autour de l'autopsie d'une momie* (Fondation Égyptologique Reine Élisabeth), Brussels, 1942.
- Jonckheere, F. "La circoncision des anciens égyptiens", *Centaureus*, I, 3, 1951, 212-234.
- Jones, W. H. S. *The Medical Writings of Anonymus Londinensis*, Cambridge, 1947.
- Junker, H. *Das Götterdekret über das Abaton*, Vienna, 1913.
- Junker, H. *Der grosse Pylon des Tempels der Isis in Philä*, Vienna, 1958.
- Junker, H. "Die Schlacht- und Brandopfer im Tempelkult der Spätzeit", *ZÄS*, XLVIII, 1910, 69-77.
- Junker, H. *Die Stundenwachen in den Osirismysterien*, Vienna, 1910.
- Kees, H. *Ägypten*, Tübingen, 1928.
- Kees, H. *Ancient Egypt, a Cultural Topography* (trans. from *Das Alte Ägypten*), London, 1961.
- Kees, H. "Apotheosis by Drowning", in *Studies Presented to F. Ll. Griffith*, p. 402-405, London, 1932.
- Kees, H. *Bemerkungen zum Tieropfer der Ägypter und seiner Symbolik*, Nachr., Göttingen, 1942.
- Kees, H. *Der Götterglaube in alten Ägypten Kulturgeschichte*, Berlin, 1956.
- Kees, H. *Das Priestertum im ägyptischen Staat*, Leiden, 1953.
- Kees, H. *Tötenglauben und Jenseitsvorstellungen der alten Ägypter*, 2nd ed., Berlin, 1956.
- Keimer, L. "Sprachliches und Sachliches zu $\epsilon\lambda\kappa\omega$, Frucht der Sykomore", *Acta Orientalia*, VI, 1928, 288-304.
- Keimer, L. "Note sur les rhinoceros de l'Égypte ancienne", *ASAE*, XLVIII, 1948, 47-54.

- Kenyon, F. G. *Greek Papyri in the British Museum*, London, 1893, 1898.
- Kienitz, F. K. *Die politische Geschichte Ägyptens vom 7. bis zum 4. Jahrhundert vor der Zeitwende*, Berlin, 1953.
- Kirk, G. S. and Raven, J. E. *The Presocratic Philosophers*, Cambridge, 1957.
- Klingbeil, W. *Kopf-, Masken- und Maskierungszauber in den antiken Hochkulturen*, Berlin, 1935.
- Knight, W. F. Jackson *Vergil, Epic and Anthropology*, ed. Christie, J. D., London, 1967.
- Kornemann, E. "Zur Geschwisterehe im Altertum", *Klio*, XIX, 1925, 355-361.
- Krall, J. "Historisch-philologische Analekten", *ZÄS*, XXI, 1883, 79-82.
- Kranz, W. "Vorsokratisches I", *Hermes*, LXIX, 1934, 114-119.
- Küthmann, *Die Ostgrenze Ägyptens*, Diss., Leipzig, 1911.
- Lacau, P. *Sarcophages antérieurs au Nouvel Empire*, Cairo, 1904-1906.
- Lacau, P. "Textes religieux", *Rec. Trav.*, XXXI, 1909, 10-33; XXXII, 1910, 78-87.
- Laistner, M. L. W. *The Greater Roman Historians* (Sather Classical Lectures, 21), California Univ., 1947.
- Lange, K. *Sesostris, ein ägyptischer König in Mythos, Geschichte und Kunst*, Munich, 1954.
- Lauer, J. and Picard, C. *Les Statues ptolémaïques du Serapieion de Memphis* (Publ. de l'Inst. d'Art et d'Arch. de l'Univ. Paris), Paris, 1955.
- Lauth, F. J. *Ägyptische Chronologie*, Strasburg, 1877.
- Lauth, F. J. "Zur Verständigung", *ZÄS*, VI, 1868, 41-44.
- Ledrain, E. *Les monuments égyptiens de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, 1879.
- Leek, F. Filce "The Problem of Brain Removal During Embalming by the Ancient Egyptians", *JEA*, LV, 1969, 112-117.
- Lefebvre, G. *Essai sur la médecine égyptienne de l'époque pharaonique*, Paris, 1956.
- Lefebvre, G. *Romans et Contes égyptiens de l'époque pharaonique*, Paris, 1949.
- Leibovitch, J. "The Statuette of an Egyptian Harper, and String Instruments in Egyptian Statuary", *JEA*, XLVI, 1960, 53-69.
- Leopoldi, H. *De Agatharchide Cnidio*, Diss., Rostoch, 1892.
- Lepsius, R. *Denkmaeler aus Aegypten und Aethiopien*, Berlin, 1849-1859.
- Lepsius, R. "Der Sesostris-Herakles Körperlänge", *ZÄS*, IX, 1871, 52-56.
- Letronne, J. A. *Examen des passages relatifs à la population de l'ancienne Thèbes d'Égypte*, 1824.

- Letronne, J. A. *Mémoire sur le monument d'Osymandyas à Thèbes*, Paris, 1831.
- Letronne, J. A. *Mémoire sur le tombeau d'Osymandyas décrit par Diodore de Sicile* (Journal des Savants), Paris, 1822.
- Linforth, I. M. *The Arts of Orpheus*, California Univ. and Cambridge Univ. Press, 1941.
- Lloyd, A. B. "The Egyptian Labyrinth", *JEA*, LVI, 1970, 81-100.
- Lloyd, A. B. "Perseus and Chemmis (Herodotus II, 91)", *JHS*, LXXXIX, 1969, 76-86.
- L'Orange, H. P. *Apotheosis in Ancient Portraiture*, Oslo, 1947.
- Lorenzen, E. *Technical Studies in Ancient Metrology*, Copenhagen, 1966.
- Lortet, L. and Gaillard, C. *La Faune momifiée de l'ancienne Égypte* (Muséum d'histoire naturelle de Lyon, Archives), Lyon, 1905.
- Lovejoy, A. O. and Boas, G. *Primitivism and Related Ideas in Antiquity*, New York, 1965.
- Lucas, A. *Ancient Egyptian Materials and Industries*, 4th ed. rev. Harris, J. R., 1962.
- Mähly, J. *Die Schlange in Mythos und Kultus der klassischen Völker*, Basel, 1867.
- Malaise, M. "Sésostriis, Pharaon de légende et d'histoire", *Chron. d'Ég.*, XLI, 1966, 244-272.
- Mallet, D. *Les premiers établissements des Grecs en Égypte*, 1893.
- Mariette-Bey, A. *Abydos*, Paris, 1869.
- Maspero, G. *Études égyptiennes*, II, Paris, 1890.
- Maspero, G. *Les momies royales de Deir el-Bahari*, 1889.
- Maspero, G. *Contes populaires d'Égypte ancienne*, 1882.
- Maspero, G. "Fragments d'une commentaire sur Hérodote II", *Bibl. Ég.*, VII, 1898, 333-427.
- Maspero, G. "La XIIe Dynastie de Manéthon", *Rec. Trav.*, XXVIII, 1906, 8-15.
- Mattha, G. "Preliminary Report on the Legal Code of Heropolis West", *Bull. de l'Inst. d'Ég.*, XXIII, 1941, 297-312.
- Mercer, S. *The Pyramid Texts in Translation and Commentary*, New York, London, Toronto, 1952.
- Merkelbach, R. *Isisfeste in griechisch-römischer Zeit*, Meisenheim am Glan, 1963.
- Meulenaere, H. de *Herodotus over de 26ste Dynastie* (Université de Louvain: Bibl. du Muséon, 27), Louvain, 1951.
- Meyer, E. *Ägyptische Chronologie*, Berlin, 1904.
- Meyer, E. *Forschungen zur alten Geschichte*, Halle, 1892-1899.
- Meyer, E. *Geschichte des Altertums*, Stuttgart and Berlin, 1910-1939.

- Meyer, E. *Gottesstaat, Militärherrschaft und Ständewesen in Ägypten* (Sonderabdruck aus der Sitzungsberichten der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil-Hist. Klasse, XXVIII, 1928.
- Meyer, E. "König Sesonchosis", *ZÄS*, LI, 1913, 136-137.
- Michaelis, A. "The Metrological Relief at Oxford", *JHS*, IV, 1883, 335-350.
- Möller, G. *Die beiden Totenpapyrus Rhind*, Leipzig, 1913.
- Mond, R. L. and Myers, O. H. *The Bucheum*, London, 1934.
- Montet, P. *Géographie de l'Égypte ancienne*, Paris, 1957.
- Montet, P. *Germanicus et le vieillard de Thèbes* (Publ. de la Fac. de Lettres, Univ. de Strasbourg, fasc. 106), Strasburg, 1945.
- Morenz, S. *Ägyptische Religion*, Stuttgart, 1960.
- Morenz, S. "Zur Vergöttlichung in Ägypten", *ZÄS*, LXXIV, 1959, 132-143.
- Morenz, S. and Schubert, J. *Der Gott auf der Blume* (Artibus Asiae, ed. Salmony, Supp. 12), Ascona, 1954.
- Moret, A. *De Bocchori Rege*, Paris, 1903.
- Moret, A. *Du caractère religieux de la royauté pharaonique*, Paris, 1902.
- Moret, A. *La mise au mort du dieu en Égypte*, Paris, 1927.
- Moret, A. *Le rituel du culte divin journalier en Égypte*, Paris, 1902.
- Moss, R. L. B. with Porter, B. and Burney, E. *Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs and Paintings*, Oxford, 1927-1951.
- Müller, D. *Ägypten und die griechischen Isis-Aretalogien*, Berlin, 1961.
- Müller, H. W. "Die stillende Gottesmutter in Ägypten", *Materia Medica Nordmark*, II, 1963.
- Müller, H. W. "Isis mit dem Horuskinde", *Münchener Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst*, XIV, 1963, 7-38.
- Murray, O. "Hecataeus of Abdera and Pharaonic Kingship", *JEA*, LVI, 1970, 141-171.
- Mylonas, G. E. *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries*, Princeton Univ. Press, 1961.
- Myres, J. "Herodotus and the Egyptian Labyrinth", *Liverpool Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology*, III, 1910, 134-136.
- Nauck, J. A. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Lipsiae, 1856.
- Neugebauer, O. *The Exact Sciences in Antiquity*, 2nd ed., Brown Univ. Press, 1957.
- Neugebauer, O. "Die Bedeutungslosigkeit der 'Sothisperiode' für die älteste ägyptische Chronologie", *Acta Orientalia*, XVII, 1938, 169-195.
- Newberry, P. E. *Beni Hasan* (Egypt Exploration Fund, Arch. Survey of Egypt), London, 1893.

- Newberry, P. E. "Queen Nitocris of the Sixth Dynasty", *JEA*, XXIX, 1943, 51-54.
- Nilsson, N. M. P. *Dionysiac Mysteries of the Hellenistic and Roman Age*, Lund, 1951.
- Nilsson, N. M. P. *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*, Munich, 1941, '50.
- Nilsson, N. M. P. *Minoan-Mycenaean Religion and its Survival in Greek Religion*, Lund, 1927.
- Nock, A. D. *Conversion*, Oxford, 1933.
- Otto, E. *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Stierkultes in Ägypten*, Leipzig, 1938.
- Otto, W. F. *Dionysos: Mythos und Kultus*, Frankfurt am Main, 1933.
- Otto, W. G. A. *Priester und Tempel im hellenistischen Ägypten*, Leipzig and Berlin, 1905-1908.
- Oxyrhynchus Papyri, ed. Grenfell, B. P., Hunt, A. S. and others; Egypt Exploration Society, Graeco-Roman Memoirs, London, 1898-1956.
- Palm, J. *Über Sprache und Stil des Diodoros von Sizilien*, Lund, 1958.
- Parke, H. W. *The Oracles of Zeus*, Oxford, 1967.
- Parker, R. *The Calendars of Ancient Egypt*, Chicago Univ. Press, 1950.
- Parker, R. "The Length of Reign of Amasis and the Beginning of the XXVIth Dynasty", *MDAIK*, XV, 1957, 208-212.
- Parker, R. "Sothic Dates and Calendar Adjustment", *Rev. d'Ég.*, IX, 1952, 101-108.
- Parker, R. and Neugebauer, O. *Egyptian Astronomical Texts* (Brown Egyptological Studies, 3), London, 1960.
- Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Stuttgart, 1893.
- Peek, W. *Der Isishymnus von Andros und verwandte Texte*, Berlin, 1930.
- Peet, T. E. *The Great Tomb Robberies of the Twentieth Egyptian Dynasty*, Oxford, 1930.
- Pendlebury, J. D. S. *City of Akhenaten*, London, 1923.
- Pestmann, P. W. *Marriage and Matrimonial Property in Ancient Egypt*, Leiden, 1961.
- Petrie, W. M. Flinders *Ceremonial State Palettes*, London, 1953.
- Petrie, W. M. Flinders *Hawara, Biahmu and Arsinoë*, London, 1889.
- Petrie, W. M. Flinders *History of Egypt*, London, 1894 etc.
- Petrie, W. M. Flinders *Labyrinth, Gerzeh and Mazguneh*, London, 1898.
- Pettigrew, T. J. *History of Egyptian Mummies*, London, 1834.
- Picard, C. "A quoi servaient les 'Dromoi' des Sarapieia?", *Rev. Arch.*, XLI, 1953, 206-209.
- Picard, C. "Sur la patrie et les pérégrinations de Demeter", *Rev. des Ét. Gr.*, XL, 1927, 321-330.

- Picard-Cambridge, A. W. *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy*, 2nd ed., Oxford, 1962.
- Piehl, K. F. *Inscriptions hiéroglyphiques recueillies en Europe et en Égypte*, ser. 1-3e, Stockholm and Leipzig, 1886-1895.
- Pietschmann, R. "Die Satyrn des Osiris", *ZÄS*, XXXI, 1893, 73-74.
- Pleyte, W. and Rossi, F. *Les Papyrus de Turin*, Leiden, 1869-1876.
- Pohlenz, M. *Die Stoa*, Göttingen, 1948, 1949.
- Posener, G. "L'Apport des textes littéraires à la connaissance de l'histoire égyptienne", in *Le Fonti Indirette della Storia Egiziana*, ed. Donadoni, S., Rome, 1963.
- Posener, G. "A propos de la stèle de Bentresh", *BIFAO*, XXXIV, 1934, 75-81.
- Posener, G. "Le canal du Nil à la Mer Rouge avant les Ptolemées", *Chron. d'Ég.*, XIII, 1938, 259-273.
- Posener, G. Communication, in *JEA*, XXIX, 1953, 107.
- Posener, G. *Dictionnaire de la civilisation égyptienne*, Paris, 1959.
- Posener, G. *Littérature et politique dans l'Égypte de la XIIe Dynastie* (Bibl. de l'École des Hautes Études, fasc. 307), Paris, 1956.
- Posener, G. *La première domination Perse en Égypte* (Institut Français d'Arch. Orientale, Bibl. d'Étude, tom. II), Cairo, 1936.
- Préaux, C. *L'Économie royale des Lagides* (Fondation Égyptologique Reine Élisabeth), Brussels, 1939.
- Pritchard, J. B. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, 2nd ed., Princeton, 1955.
- Quibell, J. E. *The Ramesseum*, London, 1878.
- Quibell, J. E. and Green, F. W. *Hierakonpolis*, London, 1900-1902.
- Ranke, H. *Die ägyptischen Personennamen*, Hamburg, 1933.
- Redford, D. B. *History and Chronology of the Eighteenth Dynasty of Egypt: Seven Studies*, Univ. of Toronto Press, 1967.
- Reinhardt, K. "Hekataios von Abdera und Demokrit", *Hermes*, XLVII, 1912, 492-513.
- Reinhardt, K. *Kosmos und Sympathie, Neue Untersuchungen über Poseidonios*, Munich, 1926.
- Reisner, G. A. *Mycerinus*, Harvard Univ. Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1931.
- Revillout, E. *Cours de droit égyptien*, École du Louvre, Paris, 1883.
- Ridgeway, B. S. "Greek Kouroi and Egyptian Methods", *AJA*, LXX, 1966, 68-70.
- Roeder, G. "Das Ichneumon in der ägyptischen Religion und Kunst", *Egyptian Religion*, IV, 1936, 1-48.

- Rogers, R. W. *History of Ancient Persia*, New York, London, 1929.
- Rohde, E. *Psyche* (trans. Hillis, W. B.), London, 1929.
- Roscher, W. H. (ed.) *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, Leipzig, 1884-1937.
- Rose, H. J. *Handbook of Greek Mythology*, 5th ed., London, 1953.
- Rostovtzeff, M. *Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*, Oxford, 1941.
- Roussel, P. "Un nouvel hymne à Isis", *Rev. des Ét. Gr.*, XLII, 1929, 137-168.
- Sachs, C. *Altägyptische Musikinstrumente*, Leipzig, 1920.
- Salać, A. "Inscriptions de Kymé, d'Éolide, de Phocée, de Tralles et de quelques autres villes d'Asie Mineure", *Bull. Corr. Hell.*, LI, 1927, 3, 378-383.
- Sandison, A. T. "The Use of Natron in Mummification", *JNES*, XXII, 1963, 259-267.
- Sandman-Holmberg, M. *The God Ptah*, Lund, 1946.
- Saunders, J. B. de C. M. *The Transitions from Ancient Egyptian to Greek Medicine*, Univ. of Kansas Press, Lawrence, 1963.
- Sauneron, S. "Les conditions d'accès à la fonction sacerdotale à l'époque gréco-romaine", *BIFAO*, LXI, 1962, 55-57.
- Sauneron, S. "Le germe dans les os", *BIFAO*, LX, 1960, 17-27.
- Sauneron, S. "Une page de géographie physique", *BIFAO*, LX, 1960, 11-17.
- Sauneron, S. *Le rituel de l'embaumement: P. Boulaq III*, Cairo, 1952.
- Säve-Söderbergh, T. *On Egyptian Representations of Hippopotamus Hunting as a Religious Motive*, Horae Soederblomianae III, Uppsala, 1953.
- Scamuzzi, E. *Museo Egizio di Torino*, Turin, 1963.
- Schaefer, H. "Ägyptische Worte bei Diodor", *ZÄS*, XLI, 1904, 140-142.
- Schaefer, H. "Nubische Ortsnamen bei den Klassikern", *ZÄS*, XXIII, 1895, 96-100.
- Schneider, G. J. *De Diodori Fontibus*, Berlin, 1880.
- Schott, S. "Das Löschen von Fackeln in Milch", *ZÄS*, LXXIII, 1937, 1-25.
- Schulman, A. R. "The N'rn at the Battle of Kadesh", *JARCE*, I, 1962, 47-52.
- Schwartz, E. "Hekataeos von Teos", *Rhein. Mus.*, XL, 1885, 223-262.
- Scott, W. *Hermetica*, Oxford, 1925.
- Scott-Moncrieff, P. D. "De Iside et Osiride", *JHS*, XXIX, 1909, 79-90.
- Seidl, E. *Ägyptische Rechtsgeschichte der Saiten- und Perserzeit*, 2nd ed., Glückstadt, 1968.

- Seidl, E. *Ptolemaïsche Rechtsgeschichte*, 2nd ed., Glückstadt, 1962.
- Seidl, E. and Scharff, A. *Einführung in die ägyptische Rechtsgeschichte bis zum Ende des neuen Reiches*, 2nd ed., Glückstadt, 1951.
- Seters, J. van "A Date for the 'Admonitions' in the Second Intermediate Period", *JEA*, L, 1964, 13-23.
- Sethe, K. *Ägyptische Lesestücke, Texte des Mittleren Reiches*, Leipzig, 1924.
- Sethe, K. *Amün und die acht Urgötter von Hermopolis*, Berlin, 1929.
- Sethe, K. *Beiträge zur ältesten Geschichte Ägyptens* (Untersuchungen, III), Leipzig, 1905.
- Sethe, K. "Der Name Sesostris", *ZÄS*, XLI, 1905, 43-57.
- Sethe, K. "Die Namen von Ober- und Unterägypten", *ZÄS*, XLIV, 1907, 1-29.
- Sethe, K. *Sesostris* (Untersuchungen, II), 1902.
- Sethe, K. *Urgeschichte und älteste Religion der Ägypter*, Leipzig, 1930.
- Shore, A. F. *Portrait Painting from Roman Egypt* (Brit. Mus. Publ.).
- Shore, A. F. and Smith, H. S. "A Demotic Embalmers' Agreement", *Acta Orientalia*, XXV, 1960, 277-294.
- Sigerist, H. E. *History of Medicine*, Vol. I, Oxford Univ. Press, New York, 1951.
- Soley, R. W. "The Origin of the 365-day Egyptian Calendar", *ASAE*, XLVIII, 1948, 261-265.
- Smith, G. Elliot and Dawson, W. R. *Egyptian Mummies*, London, 1924.
- Sottas, H. and Drioton, E. *Introduction à l'étude des hiéroglyphes*, Paris, 1922.
- Sourdille, C. *La durée et l'étendue du voyage d'Hérodote en Égypte*, Paris, 1910.
- Spiegelberg, W. "Ein Bruchstück des Bestattungsrituals der Apisstiere", *ZÄS*, LVI, 1920, 1-33.
- Spiegelberg, W. "Der ägypter König Proteus", *BIFAO*, XXX, 1930, 103-106.
- Spiegelberg, W. Communication, in *ZÄS*, XLIX, 1911, 129.
- Spiegelberg, W. (trans. Blackman, A. M.) *The Credibility of Herodotus' Account of Egypt*, Oxford, 1927.
- Spiegelberg, W. "Horus als Arzt", *ZÄS*, LVII, 1922, 70-72.
- Spiegelberg, W. *Die sogenannte demotische Chronik*, Leipzig, 1914.
- Spiegelberg, W. *Studien und Materialien zum Rechtswesen des Pharaonenreiches der Dynast XVIII-XXI*, Hanover, 1892.
- Spoerri, W. *Späthellenistische Berichte über Welt, Kultur und Götter* (Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft), Basel, 1959.
- Spoerri, W. "Zu Diodor von Sizilien I 7/8", *Mus. Helv.*, XVIII, 1961, 63-82.

- Stadelmann, R. *Syrisch-Palästinensische Gottheiten in Ägypten*, Leiden, 1967.
- Steindorff, G. *Grabfunde des Mittleren Reiches in den Königlich-Museen zu Berlin*, Berlin, 1896, 1901.
- Stern, L. "Die Randbemerkungen zu dem manethonischen Königscanon", *ZÄS*, XXIII, 1885, 87-96.
- Steuer, R. O. and Saunders, J. B. de C. M. *Ancient Egyptian and Cnidian Medicine*, Univ. California Press, Berkeley and L.A., printed in the Netherlands, 1959.
- Stiehle, R. "Der Geograph Artemidorus von Ephesos", *Philologus*, XI, 1856, 193-244.
- Tackholm, V. and G. and Drar, M. *Flora of Egypt*, Fouad I Univ. Press, Cairo, 1950.
- Taubenschlag, R. *The Law of Greco-Roman Egypt in the Light of the Papyri*, 2nd ed., Warsaw, 1955.
- Taverna, D. "Sull'origine del nome Νεῖλος", *Aegyptus*, XLVIII, 1968, 31-35.
- Te Velde, H. *Seth, God of Confusion*, Leiden, 1967.
- Théodoridès, A. "The Concept of Law in Ancient Egypt", in the new *Legacy of Egypt*, ed. Harris, J. R., Oxford, 1971.
- Théodoridès, A. "L'Acte de Sounet (vente) dans la *Stèle Juridique de Karnak*", *RIDA*³, VI, 1959, 108-130.
- Thierfelder, H. *Die Geschwisterehe im hellenistisch-römischen Ägypten*, Münster, 1960.
- Thompson, H. F. H. *A Family Archive from Siut*, Oxford, 1934.
- Thomson, G. "The Greek Calendars", *JHS*, LXIII, 1943, 52-65.
- Tondriaux, J. "Tatouage, lierre et syncrétisme", *Aegyptus*, XXX, 1950, 57-66.
- Tran Tam Tinh, V. *Le Culte d'Isis à Pompéi*, Paris, 1964.
- Turayeff, B. von "Zwei Hymnen an Thoth", *ZÄS*, XXXIII, 1895, 120-125.
- Uxkull-Gyllenband, W. G. *Griechische Kultur—Entstehungslehren* (Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie Bd. 36, heft 3, 4), Berlin, 1924.
- Vandier, J. *La famine dans l'Égypte ancienne*, Cairo, 1936.
- Vandier, J. *Manuel d'archéologie égyptienne*, Paris, 1952-1958.
- Vandier, J. *Mo'alla*, Cairo, 1950.
- Vandier, J. *Le Papyrus Jumilhac*, Paris, 1962.
- Vandier, J. *La religion égyptienne*, Paris, 1949.
- Ventris, M. and Chadwick, J. *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1956.
- Vercoutter, J. "Une épitaphe royale inédite du Sérapéum", *MDAIK*, XVI, 1958, 333-345.
- Vercoutter, J. "The Gold of Kush", *Kush*, VII, 1959, 120-153.
- Vercoutter, J. "Napatan Kings and Apis Worship", *Kush*, VIII, 1960, 62-76.
- Vercoutter, J. *Textes biographiques du Sérapéum de Memphis*, Paris, 1962.

- Vergote, J. "Le roi Moiris-Mares", *ZAS*, LXXXVII, 1962, 66-76.
- Vian, F. *Les origines de Thèbes, Cadmos et les Spartes*, Paris, 1963.
- Vikentiev, V. "Les rites de la réinvestiture royale", *Bull. de l'Inst. d'Ég.*, XXXVII, 1, 1954-5, 271-316.
- Visser, E. *Götter und Kulte im ptolemaïschen Alexandrien*, Amsterdam, 1938.
- Vlastos, G. "On the Prehistory in Diodorus", *AJP*, LXVII, 1946, 51-59.
- Wainwright, G. A. *The Sky Religion in Egypt*, Cambridge, 1938.
- Weill, R. *Recherches sur la Ire Dynastie et les temps pré-pharaoniques*, Cairo, 1962.
- Welles, C. Bradford "Ptolemaic Administration in Egypt", *Journal of Juristic Papyrology*, III, 1949, 21-47.
- Wendel, C. *Scholia in Apollonius Rhodius*, Berlin, 1958.
- Werbrouck, M. *Les pleureuses dans l'Égypte ancienne* (Fondation Égyptologique Reine Elisabeth), Brussels, 1938.
- Wiedemann, A. *Ägyptische Geschichte*, Götha, 1884.
- Wiedemann, A. *Herodots zweites Buch*, Leipzig, 1890.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. v. *Der Glaube der Hellenen*, Basel, 1956.
- Wilcken, U. *Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit (Ältere Funde)*, ed. Schubart, W., Berlin and Leipzig, 1922.
- Wild, H. *Le tombeau de Ti* (Mém. publ. par les membres de l'Inst. Français d'Arch. Orientale du Caire, vol. LXV), Cairo, 1953.
- Williams, C. R. "The Egyptian Collection in the Museum of Art at Cleveland, Ohio", *JEA*, V, 1918, 272-285.
- Wilsdorf, H. *Ringkampf im alten Ägypten*, Würzburg, 1939.
- Wilson, J. A. "The Oath in Ancient Egypt", *JNES*, VII, 1948, 129-156.
- Winlock, H. E. "Tombs of the Kings of the XVIIth Dynasty at Thebes", *JEA*, X, 1924, 217-277.
- Winnington-Ingram, R. P. *Euripides and Dionysus*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1948.
- Wit, C. de *Le rôle et le sens du lion dans l'Égypte ancienne*, Leiden, 1951.
- Wreszinski, W. *Atlas zur altägyptischen Kulturgeschichte*, Leipzig, 1923.
- Young, E. "A possible consanguineous marriage in the time of Philip Arrhidaeus", *JARCE*, IV, 1965, 69-71.
- Yoyotte, J. "Les os et la semence masculine: à propos d'une théorie physiologique égyptienne", *BIFAO*, LXI, 1962, 139-146.
- Yoyotte, J. "Études Géographiques I, la cité des Acacias", *Rev. d'Ég.*, XIII, 1961, 71-105.
- Zeissl, H. von *Äthiopien und Assyrier in Ägypten*, Glückstadt and Hamburg, 1944.

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>AJA</i>	<i>American Journal of Archaeology</i>
<i>ASAE</i>	<i>Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte</i>
<i>BIFAO</i>	<i>Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale</i>
Breasted <i>AR</i>	<i>Ancient Records of Egypt</i>
<i>Bull. Inst. d'Ég.</i>	<i>Bulletin de l'Institut d'Égypte</i>
<i>CAH</i> ²	<i>Cambridge Ancient History</i> , Revised edition of volumes I and II
<i>Chron. d'Ég.</i>	<i>Chronique d'Égypte</i>
<i>JARCE</i>	<i>Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt</i>
<i>JEA</i>	<i>Journal of Egyptian Archaeology</i>
<i>JHS</i>	<i>Journal of Hellenic Studies</i>
<i>JNES</i>	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
<i>Mem. Inst. d'Ég.</i>	<i>Memoires de l'Institut d'Égypte</i>
<i>MDAIK</i>	<i>Mitteilungen des deutschen Instituts für ägyptische Altertumskunde in Kairo</i>
<i>M.K.</i>	Middle Kingdom
<i>Mus. Helv.</i>	<i>Museum Helveticum</i>
<i>N.K.</i>	New Kingdom
<i>O.K.</i>	Old Kingdom
<i>P.</i>	Papyrus
Plutarch <i>DIO</i>	<i>De Iside et Osiride</i>
<i>R.E.</i>	Pauly—Wissowa—Kroll—Mittelhaus, <i>Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft</i>
<i>Rec. Trav.</i>	<i>Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l'archéologie égyptienne et assyrienne</i>
<i>Rev. d'Ég.</i>	<i>Revue d'Égyptologie</i>
<i>Rev. des Ét. Gr.</i>	<i>Revue des Études Grecques</i>
<i>Rhein. Mus.</i>	<i>Rheinisches Museum</i>
<i>RIDA</i>	<i>Revue internationale des droits de l'antiquité</i>
<i>Sb. Berl. Akad.</i>	<i>Sitzungsberichte der königlich-preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaft</i>
<i>TAPA</i>	<i>Transactions of the American Philosophical Association</i>
<i>Untersuchungen</i>	<i>Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Altertumskunde Ägyptens</i> , ed. K. Sethe, later H. Kees
<i>Urkunden</i>	<i>Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums</i> , ed. G. Steindorff
<i>Wb.</i>	<i>Wörterbuch der ägyptische Sprache</i> , ed. A. Erman and H. Grapow
<i>Wb. Drog.</i>	<i>Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Drogennamen</i> , ed. H. V. Deines and H. Grapow
<i>ZAS</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde</i>

THE SOURCES FOR BOOK I

The real value of Diodorus Siculus' βιβλιοθήκη ἱστορική has been debated by scholars for many years. The very title of the work indicates that little more is to be expected than a convenient compilation of earlier historical writings. And in spite of the noble declarations in his introduction, Diodorus seems generally to have achieved little more than this. Scarcely ever is he credited with any originality.

As a result, much time and effort has been spent in attempting to attribute to their original authors the various sections of Diodorus' history. Originally it was believed that Diodorus invariably followed a single author for many chapters at a time, changing his source as infrequently as possible. However, opinion has since been forced to retreat from this extreme position: it is now generally accepted that, although Diodorus drew primarily upon a single source for the different sections of his work, he also incorporated extracts from other writers.

This certainly seems to be true of many of the later books. But it would be dangerous to apply so sweeping a generalization to the entire history. It is hardly reasonable to assume that Diodorus used, or indeed could have used, the same approach in writing Book I, covering as it does the entire range of Egyptian civilization, as in writing one of the later books dealing with a limited period or subject. Once he had reached the historical period Diodorus would undoubtedly have had a wealth of material from earlier annalists and historians upon which to draw. But although it is known that several of Diodorus' predecessors other than Herodotus wrote on Egypt, our knowledge of the nature of these works is generally so limited and the evidence so fragmentary, that it is impossible to tell whether any of them took the same form as Diodorus' account.

And so in the case of Book I, the evidence from which Diodorus' source or sources may be deduced remains unsatisfactory and inconclusive. Nevertheless, as a result of earlier research done in this field, it is generally believed that Diodorus, employing the same

technique here as in his later books, drew primarily upon Agatharchides of Cnidos for his geographical information, and upon Hecataeus of Abdera for the remainder of the book. At the same time the information contained in this book is frequently dismissed as being of little value, and as consisting mainly of a philosophical discussion of the ideal state, with its roots in Greek rather than in Egyptian thought. It is these conclusions which must now be re-examined.

Unfortunately, comparatively little of the writing of either Agatharchides or Hecataeus has survived. Agatharchides is represented only by a few fragments and excerpts; while of the large portions of Book I generally assumed to have been borrowed by Diodorus from Hecataeus, much cannot be proved to have been so borrowed, and for the rest such proof as is possible depends upon a tenuous chain of reasoning with little or no means of verifying each step. In addition, much of his information is attributed by Diodorus to the Egyptians themselves or to their sacred writings. This, however, does not necessarily imply that he acquired it himself at first-hand. It is almost certain that he is drawing upon earlier authors who in turn claimed to have acquired their information from the Egyptians.

Possibly the main reason for denying that Hecataeus was Diodorus' immediate source for the majority of Book I is that of style. In his later books Diodorus reveals himself as an inaccurate and uncritical excerptor, using his sources without judgement, and occasionally duplicating events and information. Even in Book I there are examples of contradictory passages: ch. 15.1 contradicts ch. 45.4; ch. 23 is incompatible with ch. 97.4; ch. 61.1 contradicts both ch. 66.3 and ch. 89.3; and ch. 45.1 agrees with neither ch. 61.1 nor ch. 97.5. Such contradictions must surely indicate that Diodorus is using more than one source. If this is not the case, and he is drawing solely upon Hecataeus, then these faults in the collation of material, apparently typical of Diodorus, must be attributed not to him but to Hecataeus. On the evidence, though limited, which we have, this appears unlikely. It is easier to believe that it is Diodorus who is inept at selecting and collating his material. But the questions which yet remain unanswered are exactly how much of Book I may be

attributed to Hecataeus, and how accurate, and hence valuable, is the information.

The first person to attribute Book I to Hecataeus was G. J. Schneider. Over a century ago in his thesis *De Diodori Fontibus* he noted the apparent division of Book I into four sections, and maintained that with the exception of the introduction, all were from a single source. In support of this he cited the numerous duplicated passages which occur throughout the book.¹ Furthermore, he believed the source to be Greek rather than Egyptian, because of the translation of all things Egyptian into Greek terms; but the source could not be Herodotus because of the wide discrepancies between the two accounts.

As evidence for the date of the source, Schneider demonstrated that whereas Herodotus used Egyptian measurements, Diodorus uses Greek measurements.² These must therefore have been already in use in Egypt, a development unlikely before the advent of the Ptolemies. Whatever the logic of this argument, on the strength of this, together with the constant mentions of Ptolemy Philadelphus and the positive reference to Hecataeus in ch. 46.8, Schneider suggested Hecataeus as the most likely source for the entire book. Obvious anachronisms, such as the reference to Archimedes' screw in ch. 34.2, and to Agatharchides in ch. 41.4, he explained as later interpolations.

This theory was accepted for many years with little modification. E. Schwartz, in his article "Hekataeos von Teos", *Rhein. Mus.*, XL, 1885, 223-262, elaborates the steps by which most of Book I may be attributed to Hecataeus; and the conclusions he draws are for the most part reproduced in his article on Diodorus Siculus in *RE*, V, 1905, 669-672. He takes as his starting point the single passage which is attributed to Hecataeus by Diodorus himself, the description of the tomb of Osymandyas in chs. 47-49. With the reference to the chief justice in ch. 48.6 he compares the similar reference in ch. 75. The latter chapter he therefore attributes also to Hecataeus,

¹ As will be seen, these duplicated passages might suggest a possible conclusion diametrically opposed to that drawn by Schneider.

² Except for *σχόλον* in ch. 51.6 in the historical section, which, as will be seen, was almost certainly drawn ultimately, though indirectly, from Herodotus.

and with it the entire section on Egyptian culture (chs. 70-82, 91-93) which, because of its continued comparison of Greek and Egyptian institutions, he considers must be taken as a whole. The references to the *ἱερὰ ἀναγγραφαί* and to Ptolemy Lagus in ch. 46.7 and ch. 31.7 suggest that the latter is from Hecataeus; and if this is so, ch. 26.1 may also perhaps be attributed to Hecataeus, since it mentions both the sacred records and Alexander. Similarly, chs. 43.6, 44.4, 63.1 and 69.7 refer to the sacred records, and may be drawn from Hecataeus. But ch. 26 discusses the calendar, and so the other chapters containing calendrical information (chs. 49.5, 50.2; 12.8, 16.1, 22.4) may have come from the same source. And if ch. 31.7 is from Hecataeus, so may be chs. 51.6, 73.8 and 80.5-6, which also mention the large population of Egypt. While if ch. 69 is from Hecataeus, chs. 96-98 must also be ascribed to him.

Such comparisons, few of which can be in any way conclusive, may be continued almost indefinitely, and this is the method by which Schwartz substantiates his theory. But if one examines this process objectively, it becomes apparent that there is no logical reason why, at each step, one or more entire chapters should be attributed to Hecataeus on the strength of a single coincidental sentence or reference. Such reasoning is only possible if it is assumed at the outset that Diodorus did not change his source except when absolutely necessary. And, as has been said, such an assumption might well be dangerous in the case of this book. At the same time Schwartz is forced to recognize the existence of contradictory statements in Book I¹; but these he explains as variant traditions recorded by Hecataeus, rather than as faults of compilation by Diodorus.

In his earlier article Schwartz attributed all of Book I to Hecataeus, with the single exception of chs. 94-95, whose references to Mneves and Sasychis do not accord with the rest of the book. He considered the possibility that chs. 32-41 were from Agatharchides, but rejected it on the grounds that since chs. 30-31 were from Hecataeus, it was unlikely that the following chapters were from a different source. However, in his later article, Schwartz was forced to reconsider the suggestion, as the direct result of a dissertation published by H. Leopoldi, *De Agatharchide Cnidio* (Rostoch 1892). This

¹ See above, p. 2.

set out to prove that chs. 32-41 were indeed drawn from Agatharchides, and Leopoldi's conclusions were fully accepted by Schwartz. Schwartz also now suggested that part of chs. 11-27, notably chs. 15.6-8, 17-20.5 and 27.3-6, were drawn from a later "Dionysos-roman" which Diodorus used again in Book III.

This analysis of Book I is accepted by F. Jacoby in his article on Hecataeus of Abdera in *RE*, VII, 2750-2769, and in *FGrH*, 264, F 25 Comm. He expresses doubts, however, as to whether Schwartz is justified in separating chs. 94-95 because of their contradiction of the historical section. And certainly, if Schwartz can accept the apparent contradiction of chs. 15.2 and 45.4 etc. as variant traditions recorded by Hecataeus, there would seem little reason to exclude chs. 94-95 for a similar reason.

Following Schneider's original divisions, Jacoby sees Book I as composed of four sections: the first is a *theologoumena* (chs. 11-27) with an appendix (chs. 28-29); the second is a chorography (chs. 30-41); the third is a history (chs. 43-68); and the final section is composed of the *nomoi* (chs. 69-95) with an appendix (chs. 96-98). It is this final section upon which Jacoby's interest centres. He believes that what is revealed above all in the book as a whole is Hecataeus' philosophical approach to the ideal state, and that this is particularly evident in the final section: "Wir haben hier eine vollständige πολιτεία . . . über deren utopischen und protreptischen charakter kein zweifel sein kann." The description of Egyptian life is to be considered only as the starting point for what in Jacoby's view is Hecataeus' variation of the many books *περὶ βασιλείας* which were common around the time of Alexander the Great. Believing it to have little Egyptian support, he maintains that the thought and motive Hecataeus finds in the Egyptian institutions are wholly Greek in conception, and belong moreover to the thought of the IVth century B.C. Hecataeus is to be seen as the advocate of an "aufgeklärte Despotismus", his ideal is "konstitutionelles Königtum." His Αἰγυπτιακά then, represents practical politics, but is unique in applying the ideal state to a real people.

Possibly the first person to recognize that Book I had any value from the Egyptological point of view was E. Meyer. He also accepted that Diodorus used Hecataeus as his immediate source, and

originally, in his *Geschichte des Altertums*, I, 150, expressed no very high opinion of Hecataeus as an Egyptian historian, attributing to him "starker und tendenziöser Idealisierung." But in his later article, *Gottesstaat, Militärherrschaft und Ständewesen in Ägypten*¹ he revised this opinion. Discussing the final section of Book I, he suggests that although Hecataeus wrote as a Greek and from the viewpoint of his own time, his avowed intention was to present a picture of Egypt and her customs when the country was at the height of her power. The picture may be an ideal one; but it is drawn from the memory of the Egyptian priests and is not a product of Greek thought.

Thus until a few years ago most authorities were unanimous in accepting that, to a greater or lesser degree, Hecataeus was the direct source for Book I of Diodorus' history. Although individuals might differ in their reasons for believing it, or in the steps by which they attempted to prove it, there was little difference in their conclusions.² But in 1961 W. Spoerri published his thesis *Späthellenistische Berichte über Welt, Kultur und Götter*. This analyses in minute detail chs. 7-13 of Book I, and Spoerri demonstrates irrefutably that much of Diodorus' philosophical thought and of his initial discussion of religion belongs not to the time of Hecataeus, but to the 1st century B.C. The implications of this will be considered later, but it may be said that the light this sheds on Diodorus'

¹ Sonderabdruck aus den Sitzungsberichten der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften Phil.-Hist. Klasse, XXVIII, 1928.

² Indeed, the theory is still not entirely rejected: O. Murray in his article "Hecataeus of Abdera and Pharaonic Kingship", *JEA*, LVI, 1970, 141-171, agrees substantially with the conclusions of Schwartz and Jacoby, that Hecataeus is the basis of Diodorus' Book I. However, his arguments, like theirs, cannot be said to be entirely conclusive. It is perhaps going too far to claim (p. 145, n. 1) that Hecataeus, who is clearly referred to in ch. 47.1 (φησὶν) and who is presumably also included in the φασὶν of ch. 49.6 as one of the Egyptians to whom the whole of the *theologoumena* and history is attributed, is "clearly identical with the alleged authors of the oratio obliqua throughout": it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that Diodorus is using φασὶν in the general impersonal sense, not uncommon in Greek. Similarly the use of Alexander's crossing into Egypt as a chronological terminus does not necessarily point to Hecataeus as the source: this incident which marked the end of an epoch in Egypt and the beginning of absolute Greek rule must have been a convenient landmark for anyone writing on Egypt.

method of work may be as applicable to the rest of the book as to these few chapters.

Since Hecataeus must still be considered as the most likely source for this book, it may be as well to separate the passages, or rather ideas, which can be attributed to him with any degree of certainty.

The most obvious passage is the description of the tomb of Osymandyas, which Diodorus explicitly says is drawn from Hecataeus. There is no reason to doubt this, and chs. 47-49 may be attributed definitely to Hecataeus. Moreover, the words of ch. 46.8, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλοί . . . ὧν ἔστι καὶ Ἑκαταῖος, συμφωνοῦσι τοῖς ὑφ' ἡμῶν εἰρημένους may suggest that the preceding chapters, possibly as far back as ch. 43, are also taken from Hecataeus.

This is the only place in which Diodorus mentions Hecataeus by name, a point which is in itself suggestive. Certain passages, or the ideas contained in them, have been attributed to Hecataeus on the authority of parallels in other authors. Thus the idea that the king's consumption of wine was regulated by law (ch. 70.11) is attributed to Hecataeus by Plutarch *DIO*, 6: οἱ δὲ βασιλεῖς καὶ μετρητὸν ἔπινον ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων, ὡς Ἑκαταῖος ἱστόρηκεν, ἱερεῖς ὄντες. And in Book XL 3.8, Diodorus says of the Jews, τεκνοτροφεῖν τε ἠνάγκαζε τοὺς ἐπὶ τῆς χώρας· καὶ δι' ὀλίγης δαπάνης ἐκτρεφομένων τῶν βρεφῶν, αἰετὸν γένος τῶν Ἰουδαίων ὑπῆρχε πολυάνθρωπον. Since this occurs in a passage attributed to Hecataeus by Diodorus himself, I 80.6 may also be attributed to him.

To assign ch. 11 to Hecataeus on the evidence of Diogenes Laertius I, 10 is dangerous: certainly Diogenes says that Hecataeus records that Isis and Osiris were the moon and sun respectively; but this was a popular belief in Hellenistic times,¹ and there is no reason to assume that Diodorus owes this information to any one source in particular. Similarly, although both Diodorus (ch. 13.2) and Plutarch (*DIO*, 9) refer to the use of the name Amūn for the supreme god, a fact for which Plutarch admits his indebtedness to Hecataeus, there is no reason to believe that Diodorus used the same source. Nor is there any similarity of language to support such a theory.

¹ For references, see Spoerri, *op. cit.*, p. 205, n. 17.

Whether or not the chapters concerning the foundation of Thebes and the population of Egypt may be attributed to Hecataeus depends upon a highly uncertain reading. Diodorus names the founder of Thebes as Osiris in ch. 15.1 and as Busiris in ch. 45.6. The former theory is confirmed by Porphyry, *Quaest. Hom. Il.*, IX, 383 (*FGrH*, 264, F 19a): νῦν δὲ Διόσπολις καλοῦνται αἱ τὸ παλαιὸν Θηβαι, καὶ φασι δείκνυσθαι περὶ τὴν Διόσπολιν πολλῶν πυλῶν ἔχνη· ὥς δὲ † Κάτων ἱστορεῖ ἡ Διόσπολις ἡ μεγάλη πρὸ τοῦ ὑπὸ Περσῶν ἀφανισθῆναι κώμας μὲν ἔιχε τρισμυρίας γλ̄ <ἀρούρας δὲ γ̄ψ>, ἀνθρώπιον δὲ μυριάδας ψ̄, ρ̄ δὲ πύλαις διεκοσμεῖτο, ταύτην ἐτείχισε βασιλεὺς Ὅσιρις. Stephanus Byzantinus s.v. Διόσπολις (*FGrH*, 264, F 19b) gives an almost identical version. It is evident that Jacoby here considers Ἑκαταῖος as a possible reading for † Κάτων; but he quotes the same passage again (*FGrH*, 250, F 20) with Κάστωρ for † Κάτων. And it must be admitted that Κάστωρ probably bears a closer resemblance to Κάτων than does Ἑκαταῖος.

The similarity between the figures of the uncertain author here quoted and those of Diodorus in ch. 31.6 make it likely that Diodorus is using either this author or a common source for his assessment of the population of Egypt.¹ But if ch. 45 can be attributed to Hecataeus on the evidence of ch. 46.8, then it would appear that he named Busiris as the founder of Thebes. In which case the tradition naming Osiris must be from another source, possibly from the Castor named above. But whatever his source, one must at this juncture concede a certain amount of intelligence to Diodorus, since the statistics, which are ascribed by all the sources to the city of Thebes and which are patently far too high to belong to a single city, are ascribed very reasonably by Diodorus to the entire country of Egypt.

These then are the only passages for which there is the least shred of evidence that they may have come from Hecataeus. But it is too rash to ascribe to Hecataeus the entire sections in which each fragment occurs, on the tenuous and possibly coincidental evidence of a single sentence. And it is difficult to understand why Diodorus

¹ Oldfather (Loeb I, p. 103, n. 2) suggests Theocritus XVII, 82ff. as a possible source for the figures, but one is bound to admit that the mention of Ptolemy son of Lagus might rather indicate Hecataeus.

should not have named Hecataeus elsewhere in the book, if he is excerpting him as assiduously as is generally believed, particularly when one considers, for example, the many references to Ctesias in Book II.

There are, on the other hand, a number of passages for which there is at least equal evidence that they could have come from other authors. These authors range in time from the VIth to the IIInd centuries B.C., and it is difficult, if not impossible, to know whether Diodorus made use of them directly or through an intermediate source. Obviously, the earlier the date of an author, the less likely it is on the whole that Diodorus would have made direct use of him. But it does not necessarily follow that the author to whom the latest date can be ascribed is the author through whom Diodorus drew upon the others for his various pieces of information. That being the case, it is difficult to assess exactly where chronologically one may draw the line between Diodorus' indirect and direct sources.

Three passages may ultimately be attributable to Hellanicus; but his early date makes it improbable, though not impossible, that Diodorus would have consulted him directly. In ch. 13.3 Diodorus relates the story of the discovery of fire. This does not follow the usual Greek tradition, according to which it was Prometheus who stole fire from the gods and gave it to mankind. Here it is Hephaestus who discovers a tree struck by lightning and invites mankind to enjoy the advantages of fire. This version is confirmed by Tzetzes, *Lykophron*, 227 (*FGrH*, 4, F 71b): ἀπὸ κεραυνοβόλου δένδρου, ἐν Ἑλληνικαῖς Χώραις ἐν Λήμνῳ πρώτως εὐρέθη τό τε πῦρ καὶ αἱ ὀπλουργίαι, καθὼς καὶ ἐν τῷ περὶ Χίου κτίσεως Ἑλλάνικος ἱστορεῖ.¹

¹ T. Cole, *Democritus and the Sources of Greek Anthropology*, p. 201., compares this passage of Diodorus with Vitruvius, 33.16-23 and Tzetzes 74.14-20, concluding that the three may well have come from the same source (presumably not Hellanicus), and that Tzetzes is not here indebted to Diodorus. The passage of Tzetzes in question reads: οἱ προμηθέστεροι δὲ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, χειμῶνος γεγονότος, καὶ κεραυνωθέντος δένδρου τινὸς ὡς πλησιάσαντες ἐκεῖσε τῆς θερμῆς αἰσθησιν ἔσχον, μηχανῶνται φυλάξαι τὸ πῦρ καὶ δὴ σομοφοῖς τισι ξύλοις καὶ νάρθηξιν δυναμένοις τοῦτο φυλάξαι κατέκρυψαν, καὶ οὐράνιον πῦρ ὑπάρχον τὸ πρὶν οὕτω κατασχεθέν ... ἐμυθεύθη κλαπῆναι ... This is considerably closer to Diodorus' account than *Lyk.*, 227, in spite of the κεραυνοβόλου δένδρου of the latter.

Hellanicus may also be the source for ch. 94.2, on the subject of Zalmoxis (*FGrH*, 4, F 73, Prot. Suid. s.v.) Ζάμοξις . . . 'Ελλάνικος δὲ ἐν τοῖς βαρβαρικοῖς Νομίμοις φησὶν ὅτι 'Ελληνικός τε γεγονὼς τελετὰς κατέδειξε Γέταις τοῖς ἐν Θραίκῃ καὶ ἔλεγεν ὅτι οὐτ' ἂν αὐτὸς ἀποθάνοι οὐδ' οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἀλλ' ἔξουσι πάντα τὰ ἀγαθὰ. The fact that Diodorus records that his laws were divinely inspired by Hestia suggests that he believes Zalmoxis was not himself a god (as Herodotus says) but was rather a deified mortal (as Hellanicus suggests). But this may be stretching the evidence too far. The same is true of the similarity between ch. 15.8, where the discovery of the vine is said to have been made in Egypt, and Athenaeus I, 344: 'Ελλάνικος δὲ φησιν ἐν τῇ Πλινθίνῃ πόλει Αἰγύπτου πρῶτον εὑρεθῆναι τὴν ἄμπελον.

There are indications of many other authors whom Diodorus may have used. In ch. 10.1, for example, he maintains that the Egyptians were the first men to come into existence, διὰ τε τὴν εὐκρασίαν τῆς χώρας καὶ διὰ τὴν φύσιν τοῦ Νείλου. This idea is reflected in *Schol. Apoll. Rhod.*, IV, 257-262: 'Ἴππυς δὲ τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους πρώτους <γεγενῆσθαι> στοχάζεται <ἐκ> τῆς τοῦ ἄερος κράσεως καὶ <ἐκ τοῦ> γονιμώτατον εἶναι τὸ τοῦ Νείλου ὕδωρ. But the comparatively early date of Hippys (probably Vth century B.C., although this is not certain) makes it likely that this tradition would in any case have been fairly widespread by the time of Diodorus. The same is true of Diodorus' comment on the antiquity of Thebes (ch. 15.1), which may be compared with *Schol. Apoll. Rhod.*, IV, 257-262c: δοκεῖ δὲ πρῶτον Θήβην καὶ Αἴγυπτον κτισθῆναι ὥς φησι Ξεναγόρας ἐν ἀ χρόνων, καὶ Νικάνωρ δὲ λέγει ἐν ταῖς Μετονομασίαις ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ πρώτην κτισθῆναι πόλιν Θήβας, καὶ αὐτὸς συμφωνῶν τῷ Ἀρχεμάχῳ. On the other hand, Diodorus' statement in ch. 82.3 that Egyptian doctors were compelled to heal in accordance with the written law appears to be confirmed only by a passage in Aristotle, *Politics*, III, 10: ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ μετὰ τὴν τετρήμερον κινεῖν ἔξεστι τοῖς ἰατροῖς τὸν νόμον ἔγγραφον, καθ' ὃν τὰς θεραπειὰς προσάγουσιν, ἐὰν δὲ πρότερον, ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτοῦ κινδύνῳ. There is no Egyptian evidence to support this statement,¹ and one is forced to accept a direct relationship between Aristotle and Diodorus here.

Much of ch. 28 appears ultimately to be based upon Plato's

¹ But see further below, ch. 82.3 comm.

Timaeus. Thus the description of the division of the body politic into (three) orders (ch. 28.4) echoes *Tim.*, 24 A: πρῶτον μὲν τὸ τῶν ἱερέων γένος ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλων χωρὶς ἀφωρισμένον, μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο τὸ τῶν δημιουργῶν, ὅτι καθ' αὐτὸ ἕκαστον ἄλλω δὲ οὐκ ἐπιμιγνόμενον δημιουργεῖ, τότε τῶν νομέων καὶ τὸ τῶν θηρευτῶν τό τε τῶν γεωργῶν. καὶ δὴ καὶ τὸ μάχιμον γένος ἥσθησθαι που τῇδε ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν γενῶν κεχωρισμένον, οἷς οὐδὲν ἄλλο πλὴν τὰ περὶ τὸν πόλεμον ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου προσετάχθη μέλειν. Certainly the idea that the Athenians were colonists of the Egyptians, and more particularly of the Saïtes, may have originated with Plato (*Tim.*, 21 Ef.), but he records it as the belief of the Egyptians rather than of the Athenians. The theory was later widely accepted, and it is difficult to know from which source Diodorus drew his information. A possibility is Theopompus: (Proclus in *Plat. Tim.*, 21 E) τοὺς δὲ Ἀθηναίους Καλλισθένης μὲν καὶ Φανόδημος πατέρας τῶν Σαιτικῶν ἱστοροῦσι γενέσθαι. Θεόπομπος δὲ ἀνάπαλιν ἀποίκους αὐτῶν εἶναι φησίν. Ἀττικός δὲ Πλατωνικός διὰ βασκανίαν φησὶ μεταποιῆσαι τὴν ἱστορίαν τὸν Θεόπομπον, ἐπ' αὐτοῦ γὰρ ἀφικέσθαι τινὰς ἐκ τῆς Σαείως ἀνανεούμενους τὴν πρὸς Ἀθηναίους συγγένειαν. (Africanus ap. Eusebius *Praef. Evang.*, X, 10, 491a) τῶν γὰρ Αἰγυπτίων ὄργη θεοῦ χαλάζαις τε καὶ χειμῶσι μαστιζομένων, εἰκὸς ἦν μέρη τινὰ συμπάσχειν τῆς γῆς, ἔτι τε Ἀθηναίους τῶν αὐτῶν Αἰγυπτίου ἀπαλάυειν εἰκὸς ἦν, ἀποίκους ἐκείνων ὑπονοουμένους ὥς φασιν ἄλλοι τε καὶ ἐν τῷ τρικάρανω Θεόπομπος. That the Colchi were Egyptian colonists must also have been a fairly widespread conception: (*Schol. Apoll. Rhod.*, IV, 277-278a) καὶ Σκύμνος φησὶ ἐν Ἀσίᾳ ὅτι Κόλχοι Αἰγυπτίων ἀποικοί, καὶ Ἡρόδοτος ἐν β' μέμνηται τῆς περιτομῆς τῶν μορίων καὶ τῆς τῶν λίνων ὑφῆς, καὶ νόμοις αὐτοὺς φησι κεχρῆσθαι τῶν Αἰγυπτίων.

Possibly one of the most important passages in Book I from the point of view of the light it throws upon Diodorus' sources is ch. 19.1. Here Diodorus tells the story of Prometheus, but in a version which bears no relation to the usual Greek tradition. However, in *Schol. Apoll. Rhod.*, II, 1248 we find evidence of the same interpretation: Ἀγροίτας δὲ ἐν τῇ ιγ' τῶν Λιβυκῶν δαπανᾶσθαι φησι τὸ ἦπαρ Προμηθέως δόξα ὑπὸ τοῦ αἵτου διὰ τὸ τὴν κρατίστην τοῦ Προμηθέως χώραν τὸν ποταμὸν τὸν καλούμενον Αἰτὸν φθεῖρειν, ἦπαρ δὲ παρὰ πολλοῖς, ὥσπερ καὶ οὖθαρ τὴν εὐκαρπον λέγεσθαι γῆν. Ἡρακλέως

δὲ ἐξοχετεύσαντος διώρυξι τὸν ποταμὸν τὸν τε αἰτὸν δόξαι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ κεχωρίσθαι καὶ τὸν Προμηθεά λελύσθαι τῶν δεσμῶν.¹

Unfortunately the date of Agroitas is unknown, and has been placed tentatively in the IIIrd or IInd centuries B.C. If he lived in the IIIrd century B.C. then there is a possibility that Hecataeus might have had some contact with him. If he lived in the IInd century B.C., then Diodorus cannot be following Hecataeus here, and may well be using Agroitas. This might be confirmed by a passage in Diodorus IV, 26.3 which is very similar to *Schol. Apoll. Rhod.*, IV, 1396, the source for which is also given as Agroitas, suggesting that Diodorus may well have been aware of the work of Agroitas. But I 19.1 and IV 26.3 do not seem to have come down to Diodorus via the same intermediate source, since the story of Prometheus in I 19.1 differs from that given in IV 15.2. Thus IV 26.3 must presumably have been an interpolation on the part of Diodorus' mythographical source for Book IV,² or else there is at least a reasonable chance that Diodorus made direct use of Agroitas in each case.

A certain amount of his information Diodorus appears to owe to Manetho, though whether directly or indirectly it is impossible to tell. Chapters 12-13. 2, a passage dealing with the lesser gods closely resembles Fr. 83 (Loeb ed.) of Manetho as recorded by Eusebius. The latter concludes this condensed passage, γράφει δὲ καὶ τὰ περὶ τούτων πλατύτερον μὲν ὁ Μανεθῶς, ἐπιτετμημένως δὲ ὁ Διόδωρος. Perhaps the similarity of language should not be overstressed in such a condensed passage, but it is certainly close. The question arises as to whether Manetho would be likely to quote from the Greek poets; but there is in fact no reason why Manetho, who must

¹ Clearly there had been yet other attempts to rationalize the story of Prometheus, since the same passage continues . . . καὶ Ἡρόδωρος ξένως περὶ τῶν δεσμῶν τοῦ Προμηθεῶς ταῦτα· εἶναι γὰρ αὐτὸν Σκυθῶν βασιλέα φησί καὶ μὴ δυνάμειον παρέχειν τοῖς ὑπηκόοις τὰ ἐπιτήδεια διὰ τὸ τὸν καλούμενον Ἄετὸν ποταμὸν ἐπικλύζειν τὰ πεδία δεθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν Σκυθῶν. ἐπιφανέντα δὲ Ἡρακλέα τὸν μὲν ποταμὸν ἀποστρέψαι εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν — καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μεμυθεῖσθαι ἀνηρηκέναι τὸν αἰτὸν Ἡρακλέα — τὸν δὲ Προμηθεά λῦσαι τῶν δὲ δεσμῶν.

² Much of Book IV was drawn from Dionysius of Mitylene (IInd century B.C.); a certain amount was probably taken from Matris of Thebes' work on Herakles, but the date of Matris is unknown (?IIIrd century B.C.).

after all have been a man of intelligence and learning, should not have had access to the library at Alexandria.

The explanation of the Egyptian year given by Diodorus in ch. 26 can clearly be equated with Manetho Fr. 1 (Loeb), from the Armenian version of Eusebius' *Chronica*: 1. *Hi* (sc. Typhon and Horus) *primi inter Aegyptios rerum potiti sunt. Deinceps continuata successionē delapsa est regia auctoritas usque ad Bydin per annorum tredecim milia ac nongentos. Lunarem tamen annum intelligo, videlicet XXX diebus constantem; quem enim nunc mensem dicimus Aegyptii olim anni nomine indigitabant . . . 4. Sed revera dominatio quam narrant Aegyptii, deorum heroum et manium tenuisse putatur lunarium annorum omnino viginti quattuor milia et nongentos, ex quibus fiunt solares anni MMCCVI.* And Fr. 2 from Syncellus: καὶ Εὐσέβιος ὁ Παμφίλου μνηστῆς ἐν τοῖς χρονικοῖς αὐτοῦ φησὶν οὕτως· Αἰγύπτιοι δὲ θεῶν καὶ ἡμιθέων καὶ παρὰ τούτοις νεκρῶν καὶ θνητῶν ἐτέρων βασιλέων πολλήν καὶ φλόγαρον συνεΐρουσι μυθολογίαν· οἱ γὰρ παρ' αὐτοῖς παλαιότατοι σεληνιαίους ἔφασκον εἶναι τοὺς ἐνιαυτοὺς ἐξ ἡμερῶν τριάκοντα συνεστῶτας οἱ δὲ μετὰ τούτους ἡμίθεοι ὥρους ἐκάλουν τοὺς ἐνιαυτοὺς τοὺς τριμηνιαίους. This unusual explanation seems to be reflected in Proclus in *Plat. Tim.*, 22 B: εἰδὲ καὶ ὁ φησιν Εὐδοξος ἀληθές, ὅτι Αἰγύπτιοι τὸν μῆνα ἐνιαυτὸν ἐκάλουν, οὐκ ἂν ἡ τῶν πολλῶν τούτων ἐνιαυτῶν ἀταρίθμησις ἔχοι τι θαυμαστόν, but it does not appear to occur anywhere else.¹ On the face of it, it would seem unlikely that an educated Egyptian such as Manetho would propagate such a theory. But in fact it becomes credible when one recalls that Manetho lived during a period which encouraged rationalistic explanations of the improbable, and that his official history may have been intended to make the Egyptian past acceptable and even credible to the Greek rulers.

But it is an inescapable fact that Manetho's value for Diodorus

¹ It would be tempting in view of the statement in Plutarch *DIO*, 10 (Εὐδοξον μὲν οὖν Χονοῦφεώς φασὶ Μεμφίτου διακοῦσα, Σόλωνα δὲ Σόγγιτος Σαίτου, Πυθαγόραν δ' Οἰνούφεως Ἡλιοπολίτου) to attribute to Eudoxus all passages which may derive from a Memphite source (e.g. 13.2; 22.2; 50.3 etc.), and see this chapter as a Memphite rationalization of a Heliopolitan tradition (Heliopolitan because Helios is named as the first ruler, see ch. 13.2). But unfortunately similar attributions can hardly be made for Solon and Pythagoras, and thus such a theory would scarcely be tenable.

would have lain in his historical chronology. Yet Diodorus' account of Egyptian history bears not the slightest resemblance to that of Manetho. Presumably therefore, Manetho cannot be the immediate source for ch. 26, because it is difficult to believe that had Diodorus been at all familiar with Manetho's historical writings (as opposed to his other works), he could have ignored them entirely except for this isolated passage. Thus Diodorus might have drawn his information from an intermediate source, which could not then be Hecataeus; or his information may come, for example, from Eudoxus, directly or via an entirely different intermediate source.

Diodorus' discussion of the myth of Busiris raises some interesting problems. In the first place, the myth does not appear as a composite whole: in ch. 67.11 he describes the early Egyptian custom of killing strangers, and Busiris' impiety, as a fictitious invention made because of the Egyptians' disregard for normal customs. This is confirmed by Strabo XVII, 80.2: φησὶ δὲ Ἑρατοσθένης κοινὸν μὲν εἶναι τοῖς βαρβάροις πᾶσιν ἔθος τὴν ξενηλασίαν, τοὺς δ' Αἰγυπτίους ἐλέγχεσθαι διὰ τῶν περὶ τὸν Βούσιριν μεμυθευμένων ἐν τῷ Βουσιρίτῃ νομῷ, διαβάλλειν τὴν ἀξενίαν βουλομένων τοῦ τόπου τούτου τῶν ὕστερον οὐ βασιλέως, μὰ Δία, οὐδὲ τυράννου γενομένου τινὸς Βουσιρίδος. But Diodorus gives a more rational explanation in ch. 88.5, which appears to owe something to Manetho. Here he suggests that the myth is founded on a sacrifice at the tomb of Osiris of "red" men, the majority of whom must have been non-Egyptian.¹ This is confirmed by Plutarch *DIO*, 73: καὶ γὰρ ἐν Εἰλειθυίας πόλει ζῶντας ἀνθρώπους κατεπίμπρασαν ὡς Μανεθῶς ἱστόρηκε, Τυφωνείου καλοῦντες, καὶ τὴν τέφραν αὐτῶν λικμῶντες ἡφάνιζον καὶ διέσπειρον.² Diodorus' further information that Busiris was the site of Osiris' tomb (ch. 85.5) is attested by Eudoxus, according to Plutarch *DIO*, 20: Εὐδοξὸς δὲ πολλῶν τάφων ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ λεγόμενων, ἐν Βουσιρίδι τὸ σῶμα κεῖσθαι. These fragments suggest a ritual human sacrifice at the tomb of

¹ See ch. 88.5 comm. Red was the colour of Seth (the Greek Typhon) and of evil. Seth was the murderer of Osiris, hence the sacrifice at the tomb of the latter of men intended to represent his murderer.

² Cf. Porphyry, *De abstinētia*, II, 55: κατέλυσε δὲ καὶ ἐν Ἡλίου πόλει τῆς Αἰγύπτου τὸν τῆς ἀνθρωποκτονίας νόμον Ἀμωσις, ὡς μαρτυρεῖ Μανεθῶς ἐν τῷ περὶ ἀρχαισμοῦ καὶ εὐσεβείας· ἐθύοντο δὲ τῇ Ἥρᾳ . . . ἐθύοντο δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας τρεῖς ἀνθ' ὧν κηρίνους ἐκέλευσεν ὁ Ἀμωσις τοὺς ἴσους ἐπιτίθεσθαι.

Osiris, which in later times, when human sacrifice was abandoned, was transformed into a legend of Busiris as a murderous king.

But it is clear that Diodorus is not using the same source for his various chapters on Busiris. There seems in any case to be some confusion about whether Busiris was an actual person or merely a city, although Diodorus appears to conclude that it was originally the name of a city and was transferred to a mythical king. However, he gives two separate etymologies of the name. In ch. 85.5 he derives the name of the city from βούς on the grounds that Isis gathered the scattered members of Osiris into a wooden ox. In ch. 88.5, however, he claims that Busiris is the Egyptian for τοῦ Ὀσίριδος τάφου, which is in fact correct.¹ Moreover, the etymology given in ch. 85.5 may well owe its existence to the fact that the sky-goddess Nut frequently appeared on sarcophagi in the form of a cow. The accuracy of ch. 88.5 and the possible misunderstanding involved in ch. 85.5 make it clear that the respective sources for these passages had a knowledge of both the Egyptian language and Egyptian civilization. It is virtually impossible that only one source should be in question, unless it is assumed that Hecataeus, like Diodorus, was incapable of correlating his material, or that Diodorus rearranged his source material rather more freely than is usually accepted.

It will be seen from the preceding pages that in most instances, the passages for which a possible source can be postulated belong to the first or last sections of the book, which deal with Egyptian religion and civilization. The centre sections on geography and history stand apart. They have the appearance of being composite wholes, in contrast particularly with the last section, which is a conglomeration of different subjects. It may be of some value here to attempt to analyse the four sections individually.

The first section, chs. 11-29, is seen by Jacoby as consisting of a *theologoumena*, together with an appendix (chs. 28-29). As has already been said, chs. 7-13 have been the subject of a minutely detailed study by Spoerri. As a result of his research, Spoerri concludes that these chapters, far from being drawn from Hecataeus, are in fact the product of philosophical thought of the 1st century

¹ See ch. 88.5 comm.

B.C. Diodorus' account of the birth of the world seems to be an example of the *διάκρισις* cosmogonies which were evolved during this period, and according to which the four elements were separated from original chaos. At the same time Spoerri sees the influence of the Stoic and Platonic thought of the 1st century B.C. In his view, Diodorus is not using a direct philosophical source for this section, or at least not one which has survived. The philosophical elements in his account are generally a mixture, more compatible with the theory that the author has read different versions of the creation of the world and is trying to combine them into some sort of unified account. The most likely direct source for this section Spoerri believes would be Posidonius, a Stoic with interests in Platonism; but only fragments of this author survive, insufficient to substantiate the theory.

Certainly, as Spoerri maintains, Diodorus would be unlikely to draw the general introductory section of his work from an author as far distant in time as Hecataeus. And yet this is apparently contradicted by the fact that ch. 13 undoubtedly owes something to Manetho, an author almost as distant in time. But while admitting this, Spoerri attributes this chapter with the preceding ones to late-Hellenistic thought. The only explanation for this paradox must be that chs. 7-9 form the general introduction, while the following chapters begin the account of Egypt. But even if Diodorus did not excerpt Hecataeus here, there still remains, as Spoerri admits, the question of whether he reflects Hecataeus, whether he enlarged the latter's account or modernized it, or whether he used another author who excerpted or modernized Hecataeus. With the evidence for Hecataeus as slender as it is, it will be seen that Spoerri's conclusions, although applied by him only to a few chapters, are no less valid or invalid for the entire book.

Of the remainder of the first section of the book, both Schwartz and Jacoby believe chs. 15.6-8, 17-20.5 and 27.3-6 to be from a "Dionysosroman." This is unlikely to be the case for ch. 27, however, since the inscription quoted in it is a well-attested hymn to Isis.¹ But undoubtedly parts of the *theologoumena* are influenced by the myth of Dionysus. The problem is to decide where the Egyptian

¹ See ch. 27.4 comm.

account of Osiris ends and the Greek account of Dionysus begins. By Hellenistic times, Osiris and Dionysus were so closely identified that their separate myths, which were in any case similar, became easily combined. Certainly the description of Osiris' discovery of the vine and ivy, and of his journey throughout the world owes more to Greek than to Egyptian thought. And yet it is not entirely Greek.

Chapters 14-15.6 appear to contain a mixture of Greek and Egyptian thought. Chapter 16, which discusses Hermes or the Egyptian Thoth, suggests an equal mixture of ideas from both countries, although the balance is tipped in favour of Greece, as Thoth had no connection with wrestling or music in Egyptian mythology. But the reference in ch. 18.3 to the practice of growing one's hair when abroad, while not entirely substantiated by Egyptian sources, does not seem to be at all Greek in origin. Nor was Dionysus commonly associated with elephant hunting (ch. 20.1), whereas Egyptian kings were. And the reference to Maroneia in ch. 20.2 suggests that the Egyptian claim to the city is being established. This city was conquered by Ptolemy III, and remained under Egyptian rule until 200 B.C., when it was captured by Macedon. Until it was declared free in 167 B.C. by the Romans, it remained a bone of contention. This suggests further that the source for this chapter may have lived between the time of Ptolemy III and 167 B.C.¹ Certainly it appears to be the Egyptian point of view which is being recorded. Similarly, the references to the Egyptian origin of Macedon (in chs. 18.1 and 20.3) suggest perhaps an attempt to establish the Egyptian origin of the Ptolemies, an attempt which, it could be argued, might be more symptomatic of Hecataeus than of any subsequent author.²

¹ Unless the cause still rankled in Egyptian hearts even after this date. In any case it is difficult to postulate Egyptian interest in the city before the time of Ptolemy III.

² But there would in this case be an obvious inconsistency here. It is unlikely that the information about Maron and Macedon comes from more than one author, but if the suggestion concerning the date of the source for 20.2 is correct, that source cannot have been Hecataeus. Conversely, if the source for 20.3 is Hecataeus, it is difficult to imagine why he should have had any interest in the city of Maroneia. The most plausible hypothesis might seem to be that, as both Schwartz and Jacoby agree, this is part of a "Dionysosroman" which may, however, have incorporated elements of

Chapters 21-22.6 and 25.2-7 appear to represent almost entirely Egyptian thought of the Hellenistic era. Chapter 23 remains an enigma: it bears practically no relation to the Greek stories of Cadmus, but it is equally unlikely, if not impossible, that this story should have an Egyptian origin. All that can be said is that the Egyptian origin of Cadmus is attested by Hecataeus.¹ Chapter 24 may be seen as an attempt to rationalize the story of Herakles, and as such it is probably Greek. Chapter 26 apparently comes from Manetho, directly or indirectly.

Chapters 28-29 are separated by Jacoby as an appendix dealing with the colonization of the word, and in particular of Greece, by the Egyptians. Plato was the first to propound the theory, but the subject was swiftly elaborated until even the Athenians apparently accepted their own Egyptian origin. It is impossible, however, to determine Diodorus' source with certainty. He attributes chs. 28-29 to the Egyptians themselves, but paradoxically in ch. 29.5-6 he refuses to record the Egyptian account because it is attested by no historian of note. Presumably this indicates that his information is taken from a Greek source, rather than from the Egyptians. And yet, since he records the widespread colonization by the Egyptians in ch. 28.1-4, a subject apparently unconfirmed by any historian he considers creditable, his source is unlikely to be Hecataeus. The problem is a vexed one.

The second section, chs. 30-41, deals with the geography of Egypt, and the origin of the annual inundation of the Nile. In spite of the obvious difficulties involved, Schneider originally attempted to ascribe this section with the rest of the book to Hecataeus. He attempted to explain the phrase, *καινοτάτην αἰτίαν* in ch. 39.7, and the introduction of Agatharchides in ch. 41.4 by saying, *hic enim vocabulum quod est καινός, rem novam significat ac recentem, non insolentem et mirificam*² *cum praesertim Ephorus ultimus Graecorum*

Hecataeus' influence. The evidence which suggests Hecataeus as a source must in any case be regarded as the more valuable — Maron, as part of the Dionysus cycle, could hardly avoid being adopted into the Dionysus/Osiris story with the identification of the two gods; but the inclusion of Macedon in the story occurs only here, and must therefore be considered significant.

¹ See ch. 28.2 comm., and Book XL, 3.

² This interpretation will be considered later.

memoratus sit. Quodsi verum est Ephori commentationes iis cum liber componeretur temporibus recentissimas fuisse, scriptor Agatharchidem proferre non potuit; ex quo efficitur Agatharchidis sententiam postea interpositam esse. The mention of Archimedes' screw (ch. 34.2) and the description of the canal completed by Ptolemy II (ch. 33.11-12) are also to be considered interpolations.

Since these chapters can only be ascribed to Hecataeus if so many interpolations are accepted, it seems reasonable to suppose that he is not in fact the source for this section. But any attempt to identify the source is complicated by the fact that most of the information contained in these chapters must have been common knowledge. Herodotus covered much of it in his own book on Egypt; and in fact ch. 34, which describes the plants of the Nile and mentions barley beer, lotus bread and castor oil, may be compared with Herodotus II, 92-94, where they are described more fully. Certain of the information may come ultimately from Hecataeus of Miletus, but Diodorus is unlikely to have made use of him directly rather than through an intermediate source. However, it is also unlikely that Diodorus referred directly to Herodotus for this section: had he done so, one would expect a much closer relationship between the two authors than there in fact is. On the other hand, the account of the animals of the Nile given by Diodorus in ch. 35 resembles Herodotus II, 70f. in its vocabulary:

Herodotus II

70. πάντων δὲ τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν θνητῶν τοῦτο ἐξ ἐλαχίστου μέγιστον γίνεται· τὰ μὲν γὰρ ὡὰ χηνῶν οὐ πολλῷ μέζονα τίκτει, καὶ ὁ νεοσσὸς κατὰ λόγον τοῦ ὥου γίνεται, αὐξανόμενος δὲ γίνεται καὶ ἐς ἑπτακαίδεκα πῆχρος καὶ μέζων ἔτι.

71. φύσιν δὲ παρέχονται ἰδέης τοιήνδε· τετράπουν ἔστι, δίχηλον, [ὀπλάϊ βούς] σιμόν, λοφιὴν ἔχον ἵπ-

Diodorus I

35.1. τούτων δ' ὁ μὲν κροκόδειλος ἐξ ἐλαχίστου γίνεται μέγιστος· ὡς ἂν ὡὰ μὲν τοῦ ζώου τούτου τίκτοντος τοῖς χηνείοις παραπλήσια, τοῦ δὲ γεννηθέντος αὐξομένου μέχρι πηχῶν ἑκκαίδεκα.

35.8. ὁ δὲ καλούμενος ἵππος τῷ μεγέθει μὲν ἔστιν οὐκ ἐλάττων πηχῶν πέντε, τετράπους δ' ὢν καὶ

που, χαυλίοδοντας, φαῖνον οὐρὴν ἵππου καὶ φωνήν, μέγαθος ὅσον τε βοῦς ὁ μέγιστος· τὸ δέρμα δ' αὐτοῦ οὕτω δὴ τι παχὺ ἔστι ὥστε αὐοῦ γενομένου ξυστὰ ποιέεισθαι [ἀκόντα] ἐξ αὐτοῦ.

δίχηλος παραπλησίως τοῖς βοῦσι τοὺς χαυλίοδοντας ἔχει μείζους τῶν ἀγρίων ὤν, τρεῖς ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων τῶν μερῶν, ὧτα δὲ καὶ κέρκον καὶ φωνήν ἵππῳ παρεμπερῇ, τὸ δ' ὅλον κύτος τοῦ σώματος οὐκ ἀνόμιον ἐλέφαντι καὶ δέρμα πάντων σχεδὸν τῶν θηρίων ἰσχυρότατον.

Diodorus' account of these animals also resembles that of Aristotle, *Hist. Anim.*, V, 33, 558a 17-24, who appears in turn to have drawn upon Herodotus. Aristotle, however, changes the "horse's tail", retained by Diodorus, to κέρκον ὅς. It is probable, therefore, that Diodorus' source drew in turn upon Herodotus rather than upon Aristotle.

In chapters 37-41, Diodorus rejects his predecessors' theories of the origin of the Nile, and this section too shows some affinity with Herodotus. Thus in ch. 37.7 Diodorus attributes to the Egyptian priests the theory that the Nile rose in the Ocean. But Herodotus II, 21, attributes this same theory to an unnamed author, who on the evidence of *Schol. Apoll. Rhod.*, IV, 259¹ is assumed to be Hecataeus of Miletus. The theories attributed by Diodorus to Thales and Anaxagoras occur also in Herodotus II, 20. But Diodorus certainly does not follow Herodotus' account verbatim, a point which, in spite of the fact that Diodorus was wont to rephrase his sources in his own style,² suggests that he employed an intermediate source well acquainted with Herodotus.

The theory that is attributed to Agatharchides (ch. 41.4) is not an original idea. Proclus in *Plat. Tim.*, 37b says: ἄλλο δέ φασιν ὅτι αὖξεται ὁ Νεῖλος ἀπὸ ὄμβρων τινῶν, εἰς αὐτὸν ἐκχεομένων, ὥς εἴρηται διαρρήδην ὑπὸ Ἑρατοσθένους . . . d. Ἑρατοσθένους δὲ οὐκέτι φησιν οὐδὲ ζητεῖν χρῆναι αἰτίαν τῆς αὖξήσεως τοῦ Νείλου, σαφῶς καὶ ἀφικόμενων τινῶν εἰς τοῦ Νείλου πηγὰς καὶ τοὺς ὄμβρους τοὺς γινομένους ἐωρακότεων ὥστε κρατύνεσθαι τὴν Ἀριστοτέλους ἀπόδοσιν. And *Schol. Hom. Od.*,

¹ Ἑκαταῖος δὲ ὁ Μιλήσιος ἐκ τοῦ φάσιδος διελθεῖν (sc. τοὺς Ἀργοναύτας) εἰς τὸν Ὠκεανόν, εἴτα ἐκεῖθεν εἰς τὸν Νεῖλον, ὅθεν εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν θάλασσαν.

² The conclusion of J. Palm, *Über die Sprache und Stil des Diodoros von Sizilien*.

IV, 477, reads, πολλῶν λεγομένων περὶ τῆς τοῦ Νείλου ἀναβάσεως πρῶτος "Ὁμηρος τὴν ἀληθεστάτην αἰτίαν εἶπε διπετῇ προσαγορεύσας αὐτόν, διότι πληροῦται ἐκ τῶν ἐν Αἰθιοπία γινομένων ἀδιαλείπτων τοῦ θέρους καὶ σφοδρῶν ὑετῶν ὥς καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης καὶ Εὐδόξος πεπύσθαι, ταῦτα φάσκοντες ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ἱερέων. Strabo XVII, 1.5 says much the same: τὸ δ' ὅτι ἐξ ὄμβρων αἱ ἀναβάσεις, μὴ ζητεῖν μηδὲ τοιούτων δεῖσθαι μαρτύρων, οἷους Ποσειδώνιος εἴρηκε. φησὶ γὰρ Καλλισθένης λέγειν τὴν ἐκ τῶν ὄμβρων αἰτίαν τῶν θηρινῶν, παρὰ Ἀριστοτέλους λάβοντα· ἐκεῖνον δὲ παρὰ Θρασυάλκου τοῦ Θασιίου (τῶν ἀρχαίων δὲ φυσικῶν εἷς οὗτος)· ἐκεῖνου δὲ παρ' ἄλλου (Ἀλκαίου, Θαλοῦ)· τὸν δὲ παρ' Ὁμήρου διπετέα φάσκοντος τὸν Νεῖλον. If so many authors propounded the same theory, then it must surely be admitted that the person most likely to proclaim it as a new explanation devised by Agatharchides is Agatharchides himself. In this case it is possible that the ultimate source for at least chs. 37-41 is Agatharchides, followed either directly or indirectly by Diodorus.

This was proposed by H. Leopoldi in his thesis *De Agatharchide Cnidio*, in which he attempted to establish that this writer was the immediate source for the entire geographical section (chs. 32-41). Leopoldi's conclusions cannot be accepted without qualification, but it would appear in the final analysis that Agatharchides is the ultimate source for at least part of the section. But many of the arguments introduced by Leopoldi might equally well be used to prove that Artemidorus, who is known to have made copious use of Agatharchides, is the immediate source.

There seems little doubt that chs. 37-41 are drawn from Agatharchides, either directly, or through the medium of Artemidorus. Leopoldi proves this in three steps. That the passage cannot be attributed to Diodorus is clear from a major discrepancy which can only have been copied uncritically by him from his source. In ch. 37.4 he pours scorn on Ephorus' investigations, and in ch. 39.13 he says, ἀλλὰ γὰρ οὐκ ἂν τις παρ' Ἐφώρῳ ζητήσκειν ἐκ παντὸς τρόπου τὰκριβὲς ὁρῶν αὐτόν ἐν πολλοῖς ὀλιγωρηκότα τῆς ἀληθείας. These two passages are clearly inconsistent with the fact that in his later books Diodorus made considerable use of Ephorus. One may conclude therefore that Diodorus' source at this point had a certain desire for accuracy, or at least little use for Ephorus. This is consistent

with the character particularly of Artemidorus, who is known to have had a passion for accuracy. Moreover his disparagement of Ephorus is attested by a passage in Strabo III, 1.4 in which Artemidorus is recorded as saying 'Ηρακλέους δ' οὐθ' ἱερὸν ἐνταῦθα δείκνυσθαι (ψεύσασθαι δὲ τοῦτο Ἔφορον) οὔτε βωμόν κτλ.

Chapters 37-41 can in addition be shown conclusively on internal evidence to have been drawn from a single source. There are constantly recurring phrases, of which Leopoldi gives an able analysis.¹ Everywhere τὸ ψευδὲς τῆς ἀποφάσεως of the other authors is stressed (chs. 38.3, 6; 39.11, 13; 41.3), and only the opinion of Agatharchides is acceptable. Herodotus' theory (ch. 37.11), which might be true, is dismissed because it is ἀναπόδεικτα; on the other hand, Agatharchides' theory should not be rejected, because there are many paradoxes in nature.

In Leopoldi's view, the final proof that Agatharchides is the source for this passage is provided by the *solita Diodori neglegentia*. In ch. 39.7 there occurs the sentence, Ἔφορος δὲ καινοτάτην αἰτίαν εἰσφέρων πιθανολογεῖν μὲν πειρᾶται, τῆς δ' ἀληθείας οὐδαμῶς ἐπιτυχάνων θεωρεῖται. Leopoldi clearly follows the interpretation of this passage advocated by Schneider, and argues that if Diodorus were responsible for this section himself, he would refer to Agatharchides' theory as the most recent. If, however, Agatharchides is the source, he might rightly term Ephorus the author of the *novissimam causam*. But Leopoldi's terminology raises the problem of the correct interpretation of καινοτάτην. If it is to be interpreted in the temporal sense, then Leopoldi is justified in his assumption. But the interpretation of καινοτάτην as "most recent" is in itself suspect. A more accurate translation might be "most novel" without any emphasis on the temporal aspect. Ephorus' theory is indubitably the strangest of those proposed. There seems also to be some contrast in the Greek between καινοτάτην and πιθανολογεῖν πειρᾶται. If then καινοτάτην does not mean "most recent", there is no more reason to advocate Agatharchides rather than Artemidorus as Diodorus' source for this section. However, thus far there is little reason to doubt Leopoldi's general conclusions.

¹ E.g. ἡ τῆς πείρας ἐνάργεια, ἀκρίβεια, ἀλήθεια, cf. chs. 37.4, 38.3, 39.5-7, 40.5-6, 41.3.

The next step in Leopoldi's argument is to prove that chs. 32-36 are from the same source as chs. 37-41. He would argue a change of source for ch. 32, on the evidence of ch. 31.9, ἀλλὰ περὶ μὲν τούτων τὰ κατὰ μέρος μικρόν ὕστερον ἀναγράψομεν, περὶ δὲ τῆς τοῦ ποταμοῦ φύσεως καὶ τῶν κατὰ τὴν χώραν ἰδιωμάτων νῦν διέξιμεν. But one may equally postulate an earlier change of source on the basis of ch. 29.6: καὶ περὶ μὲν τῶν θεολογουμένων παρ' Αἰγυπτίου τοσαῦθ' ἡμῖν εἰρήσθω, στοχαζόμενος τῆς συμμετρίας· περὶ δὲ τῆς χώρας καὶ τοῦ Νείλου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν ἀκοῆς ἀξίων ἐν κεφαλαίοις ἕκαστα διεξιέναι πειρασόμεθα. Since Leopoldi accepts that chs. 30-31 are from Hecataeus (based on the extremely doubtful reading in Porphyry *Quaest. Hom. II.*, IX, 383, see above), he is forced to conclude that the change of source occurs at the beginning of ch. 32, although the geographical section does in fact begin with ch. 30. He then suggests that because chs. 37-41 can be ascribed to Agatharchides or Artemidorus, the whole section chs. 32-41 can be so ascribed. But this is an unqualified assumption, presumably based on Diodorus' practice in later books. Yet Leopoldi considers his assumption proved when in ch. 33.11 he finds a reference to Ptolemy Philadelphus. It is true that this is the king continually named by Agatharchides in *De Mari Erythraeo*, but it is equally true that an author describing as famous a construction as the canal to Arsinoë would naturally name its builder.¹

Up to this point in his argument, Leopoldi's evidence is equally

¹ Leopoldi attempts to strengthen his theory by proving that, since Diodorus II, 11.2 quotes Agatharchides and Artemidorus, and since the latter used the *De Mari Erythraeo* of Agatharchides, (see Strabo XVI, 4.5-4.20), then he may also have used the *Asiatic Histories*. Strabo XVII, 2.1-2.3 on Ethiopian customs resembles Diodorus III, 6-11, and Strabo is therefore here possibly using Artemidorus, whom he often follows. But Strabo on Meroë resembles Diodorus I, 33.1. Therefore in Leopoldi's opinion, all these passages are ultimately from Agatharchides' *Asiatic Histories*, II. But it must be noted that Meroë is not mentioned in detail in Diodorus III, 6-10, although it was the main city of Ethiopia, the subject of the book.

What is more important, none of Strabo XVII, 2.2, except Meroë, is included in Diodorus I, 33, although it might well be expected: Diodorus III, 3.2 describes the growth of Egypt from the alluvial deposits of the Nile, a passage which he would almost certainly have included in I, 30ff. if he were using the same source. It cannot therefore be considered certain that Agatharchides *Asiatic Histories*, II or Artemidorus are the sources in question here, or indeed that all three passages are ultimately from the same source.

valid in support of both Agatharchides and Artemidorus as the source for this section. His final proof that it is in fact Agatharchides and not Artemidorus depends on the dissimilarity between the descriptions of the Nile given by Artemidorus and Diodorus. The latter's account bears absolutely no relation to that of Artemidorus as recorded by R. Stiehle, "Artemidorus von Ephesos", *Philologus*, XI, 220-1. From this, Leopoldi argues that Diodorus must have followed Agatharchides' *Asiatic Histories*, II. This is unsubstantiated, since the only extant evidence of Agatharchides' description of the Nile is to be found in Photius (ed. Bekker, p. 447, b. 21), an account which cannot be said to bear any more resemblance to Diodorus' description than does that of Artemidorus. The evidence is at best negative.

It is, moreover, doubtful whether chs. 32-41 are taken from a single source. Chapters 37-41 appear to be a self-contained unit. This is supported by the words with which they are introduced (ch. 37.1): *μεγάλης δ' ούσης ἀπορίας περὶ τῆς τοῦ ποταμοῦ πληρώσεως, ἐπικεχειρήκασιν πολλοὶ τῶν τε φιλοσόφων καὶ τῶν ἱστορικῶν ἀποδιδόναι τὰς ταύτης αἰτίας, περὶ ὧν ἐν κεφαλαίοις ἐροῦμεν, ἵνα μήτε μακρὰς ποιῶμεθα τὰς παρεκβάσεις μήτε ἄγγραφον τὸ παρὰ πᾶσιν ἐπιζητούμενον ἀπολείπωμεν.* In addition, the information contained in this section occurs nowhere else in Book I, whereas much of that given in chs. 32-36 is repeated: 33.5 = 50.3; 34.6 = 43.5; 35.6 = 89; 35.7 = 87.5; 36.6 = 87.2; 34.10 = 20.4, and in this last example the wording is identical.

On internal evidence, then, Agatharchides may be considered the ultimate source for chs. 37-41, although Artemidorus could have been Diodorus' immediate source. It can be seen also that there is no real evidence for ascribing chs. 32-36 and chs. 37-41 to the same source. Indeed, Diodorus specifically calls chs. 37-41 a digression (ch. 37.1, *παρεκβάσεις*). On the other hand it is difficult to suggest alternative sources for chs. 30-36 with any degree of confidence. It has been seen that much of the subject matter may be compared with Herodotus, but the differences in detail are too great to suppose that he was Diodorus' immediate source. And although ch. 33.1 resembles Strabo XVII, 2.2, there is no definite proof that this comes ultimately from Agatharchides or Artemidorus, since Strabo does not name his source. Similarly ch. 33.9f. resembles Strabo

XVII, 1.25, but the latter cannot be proved to be from Artemidorus. At present it appears safest to conclude that Artemidorus was probably the immediate source for chs. 37-41, and may possibly have been the main source for chs. 30-36, although this cannot be proved by independent reasoning.

The third section, chs. 43-68, is undoubtedly based ultimately upon Herodotus: Schwartz¹ originally described the historical section as an "Umsetzung der Herodoteischen Berichte ins Pragmatische." At the same time there are references to other authors (Ctesias, ch. 56.5; ἔνιοι γράφουσι ch. 63.5). What is more important is that the description of the tomb of Osymandyas is included at the beginning of this section, and is explicitly said to be taken from Hecataeus. In fact chs. 43-50 can be separated from the rest of the section, consisting as they do mainly of an historical description of Thebes, and bearing no relation to Herodotus' account. But chs. 51-68 are so close to Herodotus' version of the history of Egypt, at least in outline, that there can be no doubt that they are based on it.

Equally there can be no doubt that Diodorus did not turn directly to Herodotus for his information. The very words in which he refers to Herodotus display his contempt for the latter's "storytelling": (ch. 69.7) ὅσα μὲν οὖν Ἡρόδοτος καὶ τινὲς τῶν τὰς Αἰγυπτίων πράξεις συνταξαμένων ἐσχεδιάκασιν ἐκουσίως προκρίναντες τῆς ἀληθείας τὸ παραδοξολογεῖν καὶ μύθους πλάττειν ψυχαγωγίας ἕνεκα παρήσομεν . . . ; (ch. 66.10) ἔνιοι δὲ τῶν ἀρχαίων συγγραφέων μυθολογοῦσι . . . (the story is reported by Herodotus II, 151); (ch. 59.2) ἐστερήθη μὲν γὰρ τῆς ὁράσεως εἴτε διὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα τῆς φύσεως κοινωνίαν εἶθ', ὥς τινες μυθολογοῦσι, διὰ τὴν εἰς τὸν ποταμὸν ἀσέβειαν (= Herodotus II, 112). There are further instances (chs. 53.1, 64.1 and 13) where Diodorus does not name the author he is discrediting, but where the person in question must surely be Herodotus. Such an attitude might be reminiscent of Manetho, who is thought to have written partly for the purpose of discrediting Herodotus. But, as has already been said, this section bears no relation whatever to Manetho's historical writings, whereas it agrees closely with those of Herodotus. Jacoby (*FGrH*, 264, F 25 comm.) suggests that such an attempt to discredit Herodotus' history is to be attributed rather

¹ *Rhein. Mus.*, XI, 1885, 235.

to Hecataeus, who had to achieve this end in order to make his own version generally accepted.

Nevertheless, Diodorus also includes much in his historical section which is not to be found in Herodotus. Thus, for example, in ch. 58.2 Diodorus records that Sesosösis was accustomed to yoke kings and potentates to his chariot in place of horses, a story unknown to Herodotus. And the name of Sesosösis' daughter, Athyrtis,¹ occurs only in Diodorus. It must also be noted that in ch. 53.1 Diodorus says that, since the Greeks and Egyptians give such conflicting stories about Sesosösis, he will give that account which accords best with the evidence of the monuments. This may suggest that his source is of a sufficiently late date to have allowed Greek variations of the legend of Sesostris to multiply. Certainly it precludes the possibility of his having used Herodotus himself.

Again, Diodorus appears to attempt to rationalize the wild stories accepted by an earlier era. The explanation that the son of Sesosösis became blind as the result of an act of impiety is rejected by him in favour of the explanation that he inherited his father's constitution (we are told that Sesosösis himself went blind in his old age). And the legend that Proteus was able to transform his appearance at will is explained by him as a misunderstanding of the custom of Egyptian rulers of wearing animal insignia. In ch. 63.8, Diodorus rejects the miraculous explanation, given by *τινὲς τῶν Αἰγυπτίων*, that the mounds constructed of salt and saltpetre, by means of which the pyramids were erected, were removed by allowing the river to flow over them and dissolve them: this is too fantastic to be credible.

Occasionally the names of the kings differ slightly from those in Herodotus' account. The most notable difference is in the writing of the name of the IVth Dyn. king Khufu. Herodotus transcribes this as Cheops, but Diodorus (ch. 63.2) uses the form *Χέμμης*. This must be derived from *Hnmw-(Hwfw)* by metathesis, and since the king-lists give the shortened form *Hwfw* alone, while the full form *Hnmw-Hwfw* is occasionally found in the cartouches, this suggests that Diodorus' source had his information directly from the Egyptians. The same is true of his reference to Chabryes (ch. 64.1):

¹ Probably an attempt to transcribe Hathor, see ch. 53.8 comm.

τελευτήσαντος δὲ τοῦ βασιλέως τούτου (sc. Χέμμις) διεδέξατο τὴν ἀρχὴν ὁ ἀδελφὸς Κεφρήν καὶ ἤρξεν ἔτη ἑξ πρὸς τοῖς πεντήκοντα· ἔνιοι δὲ φασιν οὐκ ἀδελφόν, ἀλλ' υἱὸν παραλαβεῖν τὴν ἀρχήν, ὀνομαζόμενον Χαβρύην. In fact Khufu was not succeeded immediately by Chephren; they are separated by Ra'djedef whose brother Chephren was. Thus Chabryes should be Ra'djedef, but the name appears rather to be a separate attempt to transcribe the name Khafrē'. However, there is a possibility that it in fact represents the Horus-name of Ra'djedef, which was Kheper. The main objection to such an explanation is that the kings of the IVth Dyn. were generally known by their nomen; on the other hand, it is clear that Diodorus is recording a variant tradition, and it is possible that directly or indirectly he owes this information to the Egyptian priests, who might be expected to have a record of the Horus-name of Ra'djedef.¹

Although the lists of kings given by the two authors agree on most points, there are several names which are recorded only by one of them. Thus in Diodorus' history, Amasis and Mendes (or Marrus) are recorded as ruling between Sesoösis II and Proteus, whereas in Herodotus' version Proteus succeeds Pheron, the son of Sesostris, directly. And while Herodotus records the reigns of Anysis and Sethos as occurring between those of Shabaka and the twelve rulers, in Diodorus' account the twelve rulers succeed Shabaka immediately after a two-year period of anarchy.

In addition to including information not given by Herodotus, Diodorus appears to transpose material that occurs in Herodotus. Thus the story of Psammis and the Eleans, which is included in the historical section of Herodotus (II, 160), is placed by Diodorus in his section on lawgivers (ch. 95.1). But the king involved here is not Psammis but Amasis. And whereas Diodorus goes on to relate the dealings between Amasis and Polycrates (ch. 95.3), Herodotus attributes this not to his Psammis, but to Amasis, and includes the story in Book III, 40. Moreover, the account of the revolt in the reign of Psammetichus (Herodotus II, 30) is restored by Diodorus to its correct chronological position.

Clearly Diodorus must be using an account which is based on that of Herodotus, or else he is himself correlating two or more

¹ See further ch. 64.1 comm.

sources, one of which is Herodotus. It must be confessed that in the light of Diodorus' obvious disparagement of Herodotus, the latter seems unlikely. The alternative appears to be that Diodorus drew his entire historical section from a source who in turn based his account on Herodotus, but incorporated additional information. For example, ch. 66.3-6 must presumably come ultimately from Herodotus, since Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, XXXVI, 13 cites only him as the author of the theory that the Labyrinth was built by the Dodecarchy; in which case ch. 61 cannot come from Herodotus, but from a more accurate source.

That this source could be Hecataeus, as Jacoby suggests,¹ is supported by a certain amount of evidence: the historical section contains an element of philosophical or idealistic thought on such subjects as capital punishment (ch. 65.3ff.), and the relationship between ruler and subjects (chs. 54.1-2, 64.9), which one might associate with Hecataeus. But it is generally assumed that Hecataeus intended his work to displace Herodotus, and if this is so, it is difficult to understand why he should have made such extensive use of Herodotus' account.

There remains the possibility that Diodorus is combining an author of the Herodotean school with one of the Manethonian school. The latter would account for the hostile attitude towards Herodotus, which seems to have been established by Manetho. Or these two hypothetical authors may in fact be one; Plutarch in his treatise *De Iside et Osiride* is believed to have made use in particular of an as yet unidentified source which incorporated both Hecataeus and Manetho.² In tentative support of this, there is a single instance

¹ *RE*, VII, 2750-2769.

² Griffiths, *Plutarch*, p. 100, suggests that a Stoic author of neo-Platonic sympathies would provide the necessary link between Manetho, Eudoxus and Hecataeus, who seem to have been the main basis for Plutarch's treatise. But while this link seems still to be missing, the importance of Posidonius' influence must not be ignored.

It is, incidentally, of interest to note that Griffiths regards the discrepancies in Plutarch as indicative of the fact that the latter used more than one compilation: "A unitary source-compilation shaped by one viewpoint would not have shown such manifest inconsistency." One may draw exactly the same conclusion concerning Diodorus in view of the number of obviously contradictory passages (see above, p. 2).

in Diodorus' historical section where Diodorus' vocabulary bears a closer resemblance to that of Manetho than to that of Herodotus: this is the story reported in ch. 55.8:

Diodorus I, 55.8

τὴν δὲ στήλην κατασκεύασεν ἔχουσαν αἰδοῖον ἐν μὲν τοῖς μαχίμοις ἔθνεσιν ἀνδρός, ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἀγεννέσι καὶ δειλοῖς γυναικός, ἀπὸ τοῦ κυριωτέρου μέρους τὴν διάθεσιν τῆς ἐκάστων ψυχῆς φανερωτάτην τοῖς ἐπιγινομένοις ἔσεσθαι νόμιζων.

Manetho Fr. 34 (Loeb ed.)

πανταχόσε μνημόσυνα ἐγείρας τῆς τῶν ἔθνων σχέσεως, ἐπὶ μὲν τοῖς γενναίοις ἀνδρῶν, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖς ἀγεννέσι γυναικῶν μόρια ταῖς στήλαις ἐγχαράσσω, ὥς ὑπὸ Αἰγυπτίων μετὰ Ὅσιριν πρῶτον νομισθῆναι.

The words of Herodotus bear no relation to either of the later accounts. On the other hand, the resemblance between Manetho's and Diodorus' versions is by no means close enough to be conclusive.

The fourth and last section of Book I, covering as it does all aspects of Egyptian civilization, is remarkable. It is this section which is usually considered to be the crux of Hecataeus' description of the ideal state. Throughout it there appears to be an overall hidden contrast between the Egyptian and Greek states.¹ But in the view of both Schwartz and Jacoby, the facts of Egyptian civilization are to be regarded merely as the starting-point for a πολιτεία, and as a result both critics discount the historical value of the account. Indeed, neither regard this section as having any historical value at all: to them it is an obvious picture of an ideal state, and as such represents Greek thought of the IVth century B.C. They suggest that chs. 70-71 in particular are to be interpreted as Hecataeus' conception of Utopia constructed on the basis of Greek political theory. Moreover, this picture of kingship is supposed to be typical of Ptolemy I and his court.

But with this Meyer disagrees.² He believes such a tendency to be wholly foreign to the texts. Accepting that the source is Heca-

¹ Chapters 74.6-7; 76.1; 73.5; 92.5; 93.5; 81.7.

² *Gottesstaat, Militärherrschaft und Ständewesen in Ägypten.*

taeus, he maintains that the latter's intention was to describe Egypt at the height of her power (*cf.* chs. 71.5, 72.6), and that his description derived from the Egyptian priests, not from Greek philosophy. The close association between the priests and the king reached its peak in the New Kingdom, when Thebes became virtually an autonomous state ruled by high priests, completely overshadowing the monarchy,¹ and this may well be the basis for Diodorus' account. The connection between priests and king persisted until a late date, and even the Ptolemies maintained the fiction. But it is hardly to be supposed that Hecataeus saw in the court of Ptolemy I his idea of Utopia.

The subsequent chapters of this section dealing with the structure of Egyptian society, law, education, medicine, zoology and its causes, and embalming, are all of historical value, and are all supported in some measure by the Egyptian texts. Indeed, they are in many cases so accurate (e.g. ch. 75 on court procedure; ch. 82.1-2 on the concept of residues), that one can only assume that Diodorus' source had his information directly from the Egyptians. This is particularly true of the chapter on embalming (ch. 91): in a few points this passage coincides with Herodotus' account, but in the main it supplements it. As a result it is impossible to believe that Diodorus here made any use whatever of Herodotus' account. It is difficult to believe that Herodotus obtained his information other than by hearsay; certainly there is nothing to suggest that he actually witnessed the embalming process. But while a traveller of the Hellenistic era might well have had access to ancient records, or at least to the priests in charge of them, Diodorus' description of the initial ritual of the paraschist definitely gives the impression of being an eye-witness report on the part of someone. If this ritual was still performed during the Hellenistic period, and this is not merely a report taken from older records, then the priest Manetho might well be considered the most likely person to have witnessed the spectacle. It is in any case strange that Herodotus makes absolutely no reference to it.²

Of the final two subjects in this section, that dealing with the

¹ See ch. 70 comm.

² See further ch. 91 comm.

Egyptian law-givers (chs. 94-95) was originally separated by Schwartz from the rest of the book as not being the work of Hecataeus. Although Jacoby expressed doubts about this, it does in fact seem unlikely that Hecataeus could have written ch. 95.5-6 praising the Persian Darius and denigrating the Ptolemies as rulers. Such an attitude is hardly likely to have been taken by Hecataeus, writing as he was at the outset of Macedonian rule. It must rather be taken to reflect later native nationalism, or perhaps the attitude of Diodorus himself.¹

Chapters 96-98, in spite of the slight awkwardness of their structure and position, are definitely connected with earlier sections in the book. The Greek travellers in Egypt are constantly mentioned, and are gathered together in these chapters in a final summary of Greece's debt to Egypt. Possibly the fact that the latest traveller mentioned is Eudoxus (IVth century B.C.) might be taken to suggest that the source of the information is Hecataeus.

As has been seen, chs. 37-41 and possibly chs. 30-36 may be separated from the rest of the book and attributed to Agatharchides or Artemidorus. But for the remainder the evidence must remain inconclusive. Of the authors to whom various ideas and passages may be attributed, only Agrotas, Xenagoras, Manetho and Eratosthenes, together with the unknown source of ch. 20, lived after Hecataeus; so that if the passages in question can be said to have originated with them, in itself a doubtful assumption, they cannot have occurred in Hecataeus' account. Even the hymn to Isis (ch. 27) cannot be dated with certainty; all that can be said is that the original cannot be later than the 1st century B.C., and is possibly much earlier.

As will be seen from the commentary, much of Diodorus' information has far more support from Egyptian texts and archaeological evidence than has been previously imagined. The etymologies, for example, given in ch. 11,² far from being the product of late-Hellenistic philosophy as is often believed, may well be genuine Egyptian etymologies; even if they are not ancient in origin, they may still have been invented by the Egyptians themselves at a date

¹ Murray, *JEAs*, LVI, 1970 p. 149.

² See comm.

when their own knowledge of the true meaning of their hieroglyphs had become slender in the extreme. Similarly the words discussed in chs. 17.5, 28.4, 88.5, 96.8 are all based on a knowledge of the Egyptian language. As far as we can tell, however, Diodorus had no knowledge of Egyptian: *Schol. Tzetzes Exegesis of Hom. Il.* notes, *περὶ τῶν Αἰθιοπικῶν γραμμάτων Διο[δώρος] μὲν ἐπεμνήσθη καὶ μερικῶς εἶπεν ἄλλ' ὥσπερ ἐξ ἄκοῆς ἄλλου μαθὼν καὶ οὐκ ἀκριβῶς αὐτὸς ἐπιστάμενος [εἶ] καὶ τινα τούτων κατέλεξεν ὥσπερ ἐν οἷς οἷδε παρρησιάζεται.* If the uncertain reading of the name is accepted, this must refer to Book III, 4, where Diodorus discusses Egyptian writing more fully. The fact that Book III, 4 is probably taken from Agatharchides or Artemidorus does not invalidate the theory, since if Diodorus had had sufficient knowledge of the subject himself, he would scarcely have needed to make use of another author. His source or sources in Book I, then, must have been well acquainted with Egyptian civilization and must also have achieved a certain grasp of the Egyptian language—a fact which favours Manetho and Hecataeus. But if the historical section is to be considered as the work of the same source as the rest of the book, this raises a considerable problem.

In the first place, the history of Egypt is continued only down to the time of Amasis (Ahmose II, XXVIth Dyn., 569-526 B.C.) in accordance with the account of Herodotus Book II. It is difficult to see why Hecataeus should use Herodotus at all, since he would appear to have been able to extract accurate information on other topics from the Egyptians; and more particularly, why he should bring his account to a close over two hundred years before his own time. One might naturally expect him to conclude his history with the conquest of Egypt by Alexander, as signifying the end of one epoch and the beginning of another. To assert that he tactfully refrains from describing the conquest of Egypt by both Persians and Greeks does not altogether answer the question. It is true that the reference in ch. 20.3 to the Macedonians as descendants of Osiris may be purely diplomatic; but there are several references to the Persian conquest in chs. 46.4, 58.4, 95.4. And whereas the last of these occurs in a chapter already mentioned as unlikely to be based on Hecataeus, the first occurs in the introduction to the description

of the tomb of Osymandyas, and may well be taken from Hecataeus. However, there is nowhere an explicit reference to Alexander as the conqueror of Egypt, although he is several times mentioned as its ruler, and this may be suggestive. But the evidence is at best negative.

A few passages can be ascribed to Diodorus himself with some certainty: ch. 83.8 which gives an eye-witness account of the lynching of a Roman for killing a cat; chs. 69.2 and 77.1 which stress the use of historical information; ch. 44 where Diodorus refers to his own visit to Egypt in the time of Ptolemy XI; and ch. 50.6 where he says, διόπερ ἀπὸ τούτων τῶν χρόνων ἤρξατο ταπεινοῦσθαι μὲν τὰ περὶ τὰς Θήβας αὖξασθαι δὲ τὰ περὶ τὴν Μέμφιν, ἕως Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ βασιλέως· τούτου γὰρ ἐπὶ θαλάττῃ τὴν ἐπώνυμον αὐτῷ πόλιν οἰκίσαντος οἱ κατὰ τὸ ἐξῆς βασιλεύσαντες τῆς Αἰγύπτου πάντες ἐφλοτιμήθησαν εἰς τὴν ταύτης αὖξησιν. Such a statement obviously could not have been made by Hecataeus.¹ If these passages can be attributed to Diodorus himself, it is reasonable to assume that there are other such passages incorporated in the text, which cannot be identified since they contain no obviously datable material.

As has been said, it is generally assumed from the evidence of his later books that Diodorus was a careless author, excerpting uncritically and at great length his different sources, and contributing original ideas as little as possible. It was this assumption which made it possible to accept the theory that Hecataeus was his sole source for virtually the whole of Book I. But on the grounds of structure and style it may be said that Book I lacks a certain unity. It is divided into four main sections (religion, geography, history and social customs), but within each section the material is presented in a confused fashion, with facts being anticipated, repeated, contradicted, and chronologically misplaced. The overall impression is that Diodorus first divided his book mentally into four main topics for discussion, and then collected his material for each section. Thus the edible fruits of the Nile are listed in the zoogony (ch. 10.1),

¹ This passage need not, however, belong to Diodorus himself, but it must have been taken from someone living a great deal later than the time of Alexander. It might possibly be used to support the theory of a later author combining Hecataeus and Manetho, conjectured above.

the geography (ch. 34), and the early history (ch. 43.1). Thebes is mentioned under religion (ch. 15.2), history (ch. 45.4), and the list of Greek travellers in Egypt (ch. 97.7). Bocchoris is discussed under history (chs. 45.2, 65.1), social customs (ch. 79.1) and under the lawgivers (ch. 94.5). Examples of such duplicated passages are numerous. The contradictory passages, some of which were mentioned above, would then be explained by the fact that Diodorus collected his information on each subject from more than one source.

Such an hypothesis need not necessarily invalidate the theory that Hecataeus may have been the source for much of Book I. But it is impossible to attribute to him the major part of the book without accepting that he is responsible for the numerous repetitions and contradictions, and we have no evidence that these were characteristic of his writing. It is too easy to attribute to an author, the major part of whose work has been lost, passages for which an alternative source is not immediately apparent. Moreover, it cannot be ignored that certain passages may well have had their origins in authors considerably later than Hecataeus, and that Diodorus is himself responsible for others. It is safer then to conclude that in Book I Diodorus drew upon Agatharchides or Artemidorus for chs. 37-41 and possibly for part of chs. 30-36; while for the rest of the book he undoubtedly made some use of Hecataeus of Abdera, at the same time incorporating material from other widely different authors into the framework of his own construction.

COMMENTARY

CHAPTERS 1-5

Diodorus' general introduction to his history, a eulogy of this form of literature, reaches a degree of eloquence unsurpassed by any other author, and far superior to the rest of his work.¹ It has been his purpose, he tells us, to write a universal history for a number of reasons: history offers to all the fruits of other men's experience without its attendant hazards, and is in that respect a kind of clearing-house of knowledge; it is the instigator of virtue in that it inspires men with a desire for, and offers them the chance of, immortality; and it contributes to the power of speech, in that it is, for Diodorus, the ideal form of literature, συμφωνούντων ἐν αὐτῇ τῶν λόγων τοῖς ἔργοις.² And a universal history which enables its readers to grasp in a single narrative the past events of many diverse nations must surpass all others, as the whole is more useful than the part.³

This pragmatic view of history as a guide to behaviour was quite common in antiquity. It occurs in both Greek and Roman historians from the time of Thucydides onwards,⁴ and it is also implied by Aristotle that in public affairs men must learn from the past:⁵ thus there seems to have been a general conviction that the writing of history must aim at the edification of the reader. But the idea reaches its peak with Diodorus, who discourses at length, both

¹ It is clear from I, 4.6 that this introduction was written after the history had been completed, but before it was officially published.

² I, 2.7. Diodorus apparently has no conception of the possible falsification of history—a highly idealistic view, in conformity with his general eulogistic introduction.

³ ὅσῳ χρησιμώτερόν ἐστι τὸ πᾶν τοῦ μέρους. (I, 3.8). Cf. Polybius I, 4.6ff. for the same analogy.

⁴ Thuc. I, 22.4; II, 48.3; Ephorus, *FGrH*, 70, F 42; Polybius I, 1.2; Sallust, *Jug.*, 4.5; Livy, *Praef.*, 10; Dion. Hal., *AR*, I, 6.4; V, 56.1; V, 75.1; XI, 1.4; Dio Chrys., XVIII, 9. See also Laistner, *The Greater Roman Historians*, ch. 1, esp. p. 9ff., for the part played by history in training the character.

⁵ *Rhet.*, 1393 Af.

fluently and eloquently, on the precise ways in which history may be of use.

In general Diodorus is commonly believed to owe his introductory chapters to either Ephorus or Posidonius. Jacoby, *FGrH*, 70, F 7-9 Comm.¹ supposes Ephorus to be his source, a view also maintained by Barber, *The Historian Ephorus*, p. 70, 103.² It is, however, more likely that it is the unorthodox Stoic Posidonius, if anyone, who has influenced Diodorus here. Certainly Diodorus refers both to the Stoic Divine Providence and to the Stoic doctrine of the universal kinship of mankind as a justification for writing universal histories.³ This doctrine had been anticipated by Polybius, who insisted on the unity of human history: history must be universal because the whole is always more than the sum of the parts.⁴ Posidonius, however, also believed that history must be universal, but for him this had a wider application: he saw the study of human affairs as only part of the understanding of the wider and truly universal process of the cosmos.⁵ Posidonius believed the historian to be a minister of Divine Providence or *πρόνοια*, forced to account for universal order.

But we cannot necessarily assume that Diodorus is using any particular source here: there is no real linguistic evidence that he is making direct use of Posidonius, and he certainly never refers to him by name. It seems, moreover, highly unlikely that Diodorus would have based the general introduction to his entire history on the work of any one predecessor. If he is influenced by either Ephorus or Posidonius, and the possibility can be neither denied nor proved, then one must assume that it is only to the extent that anyone is influenced by the thought of his contemporaries and predecessors. The Stoic sense of community and concept of a cosmopolis was, under Roman rule, fast becoming a reality. The time was rapidly approaching when a man might travel half across the world without being unable to make himself understood, and without

¹ Cf. *FGrH*, 70, F 109 comm.

² See also Ullman, *TAPA*, LXXIII, 1942, 30, n. 31.

³ I, 1.3. See Reinhardt, *Kosmos und Sympathie*, p. 184f. (cf. p. 52, n. 2); Laistner, *op. cit.*, p. 19f.

⁴ Polybius I, 4.6ff.

⁵ Baldry, *The Unity of Mankind in Greek Thought*, p. 178.

feeling himself a stranger in an alien land. Syrians, Greeks, Iberians and Romans were now united in their common interests. Little wonder then, that in such an age Diodorus should find himself unconsciously influenced by Stoic doctrine.

If one looks at the introduction as a whole, it becomes apparent that only the first two chapters, which are a eulogy of history, might perhaps have been taken by Diodorus from an earlier author: for the rest, ch. 3 gives Diodorus' personal reasons for undertaking his work, ch. 4 deals with his methods and with the contents of the various books, ch. 5 with the chronology. Indeed chs. 3-5 are virtually an *apologia*, a defence of his work. He says more than once that to write a universal history is a vast undertaking;¹ and he immediately goes on to say that its value lies in the fact that it unites in a single narrative the facts which are so hard to come by for the ordinary historical researcher, because historical writings are so numerous, so varied, and so difficult to obtain. In other words, Diodorus himself has had, in order to write his universal history, to undergo the tribulations of the general historical researcher. And, as he says,² he has worked for thirty years collecting material,³ visiting the countries concerned,⁴ and actually writing the history. He concludes his introduction with the pious hope that the better passages of his work will not be the object of envy, and that any defects will be corrected by more expert historians.⁵ One is left with the impression that Diodorus, while warning his reader in advance that much of his material is second-hand,⁶ is nevertheless asserting that his approach to historiography is far more comprehensive and thorough than that of his predecessors.

From his criticism of his predecessors, it becomes clear that Diodorus believes himself to have written the first genuinely "universal" history: earlier historians have confined their records to a single race, have failed to give accurate dates to events, or have failed to

¹ I, 3.3; I, 3.6; I, 4.2.

² I, 4.1.

³ I, 4.2ff.

⁴ But see below ch. 4.1.

⁵ I, 5.2. One has to admit that there seems to be more than a trace of complacency and false modesty in this particular paragraph.

⁶ I, 4.2ff.

include the mythological period because of the difficulties involved; and those who *have* written histories of all peoples have none of them continued beyond the Macedonian period, ending their accounts at the latest with the Diadochi or Epigoni.¹ In fact, very few of Diodorus' predecessors were "universal" historians in his sense of the word: Herodotus wrote on Greeks and barbarians, but within a limited period; Timaeus of Tauromenion wrote on the Greek world alone, from the beginnings to the First Punic War; Ephorus of Cyme ignored the mythological period, and his work ended with the year 340 B.C., though he had lived through the next twenty years. Polybius believed himself to be writing a universal history, acknowledging only Ephorus as his predecessor in this sphere.² His aim was to show how the events in various areas had become interwoven into a whole since the 140th Olympiad. But this Diodorus would hardly have regarded as "universal." All these historians plainly fall short of Diodorus' ideal, and he makes it obvious that he intends to rectify their faults.

Chapters 1 and 2 then, are the only ones that might plausibly be assigned to Posidonius. But one can scarcely be dogmatic on this point. As has been said, it seems totally unlikely that in the opening chapters of his introduction Diodorus should use any specific source. On the other hand it is more than possible that he reflects the general attitude towards history prevalent in his age,³ that is, the concept of the unity and utility of history. It is the fashion to accuse Diodorus of what is at best total plagiarism, at worst virtual idiocy; but he deserves kinder treatment than this. And here, if ever, at the beginning of his monumental work, he should be credited with some originality.

CHAPTER 4

4.1 Although Diodorus claims to have visited a large portion of Asia and Europe in order to see the most important places for

¹ The Diadochi were the immediate successors of Alexander, who soon after the latter's death divided up his conquests to form separate kingdoms. The Epigoni were the next and succeeding generations.

² V, 33.2.

³ Cf. Spoerri's conclusions for chapters 7, 8, 10-13. See above p. 16.

himself, and thereby eliminate errors made through ignorance of sites, there is little evidence in his history to suggest that this is in general true. Certainly he must have visited Egypt: he says in I, 44.1 that the visit took place during the 180th Olympiad (60-56 B.C.). Again in I, 83.8 he mentions an incident which he himself saw while in Egypt, the lynching of a Roman for killing a cat, when Πτολεμαῖος μὲν ὁ βασιλεὺς ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων οὕτω προσηγόρευτο φίλος. The king concerned was Ptolemy XI, better known as Auletes, who had ascended the Egyptian throne in 80 B.C. He waited twenty years for official recognition by Rome, and this was finally achieved through the efforts of Caesar and Pompey in 59 B.C. The importance of this incident lies in the fact that although the Roman was connected with the official embassy and the Egyptians were doing their best to conciliate Rome, the killing of a cat, albeit accidentally, was considered a crime so monstrous that even the intervention of the Egyptian king could not save the man from mob violence. Such an incident is most likely to have occurred in a region where the cat was held to be particularly sacred; in other words, probably in Bubastis. It is reasonable to assume, then, that Diodorus visited Bubastis.¹

Whether he travelled further south than this remains a matter for speculation. He mentions that a shrine of Isis in the temple-area of Hephaestus at Memphis "is pointed out to this day",² but this need not necessarily suggest that he had himself seen it. One can probably assume that he visited Alexandria, the obvious point of arrival for a visitor of literary tastes; and if he visited Bubastis, he may well have travelled fairly extensively in the Delta area.

Diodorus also claims to have stayed at Rome, and there is no reason to doubt this. It would be the obvious centre for his researches.³ But if he ever visited Athens, it is strange, to say the least, that he passes over the Acropolis in silence.

4.6-5.1 There is a remarkable discrepancy in Diodorus' calculations of chronology here. According to him, his first six books cover the period before the Trojan War, books VII to XVII cover

¹ See also below ch. 83.8.

² I, 22.2.

³ I, 4.2.

the period from the Trojan War to the death of Alexander the Great, and the last twenty-three books continue the history down to the Athenian archonship of Herodes in 60/59 B.C., the year which saw the beginning of the Gallic (or as Diodorus calls it, Celtic) War. Thus far is clear enough. But Diodorus goes on to say that, while he has not attempted to establish dates before the Trojan War since there is no trustworthy chronology, for the subsequent period he follows Apollodorus of Athens in marking eighty years between the Trojan War (1184 B.C.) and the Return of the Heraclidae (1104 B.C.), from then to the 1st Olympiad (776/5 B.C.) 328 years, and from the 1st Olympiad to the beginning of the Celtic War 730 years. There is no mistake in these numbers, as Diodorus goes on to give their sum as 1138. But 730 years from the 1st Olympiad brings us to 46/5 B.C., fifteen years later than the date at which he has just said (I, 4.7, fin.) his history finishes.

The problem is a difficult one. It seems clear that Diodorus at some point intended to bring his history down to a later date than he actually succeeded in doing: in III, 38.2, V, 21.2 and V, 22.1 he says he will speak of Britain in more detail when he recounts the deeds of Julius Caesar, suggesting that his intention was to reach at least the year 54 B.C. In which case, Oldfather suggests,¹ there is no reason to believe that he would not have brought his history down to 46/5 B.C., the year which marked the end of the first phase of the Civil War.² And since these references belong to the early books, Oldfather suggests further that, as Diodorus grew older and perhaps felt his work beginning to flag, he decided to end it earlier than he had originally anticipated, with the year 60 B.C.

But this theory can scarcely be accepted. If, as seems probable, Diodorus was writing Book I as early as 56 B.C.,³ he can hardly at

¹ Loeb, p. xix.

² At the same time he could avoid the awkward and fateful year, 44 B.C. See Bowersock, *Augustus and the Greek World*, p. 122, n. 2.

³ This can be deduced from I, 44.4, where he says that the Macedonians have ruled for 276 years. Since he dates Alexander's conquest of Egypt to 331 B.C., (XVII, 49), this suggests that Diodorus was writing Book I in 56 B.C. The same passage (I, 44.4) incidentally, may perhaps suggest that Diodorus died before 30 B.C.: the Macedonians are mentioned as the last foreigners to rule Egypt, and one suspects that had Diodorus lived to see

this time have intended to end his history with the year 46/5 B.C. It is far more probable that his intended terminus was at least at this stage 60/59 B.C., that is, just before his visit to Egypt. However, it is reasonable to assume that as time passed, so he extended his projected finishing point. There is, for example, no difficulty in believing that Book III was written soon after 54 B.C., and that the reference in III, 38.2-3 to Caesar's invasion of Britain marked his new resolution to include this event in his history.¹ But even this cannot explain his reference in I, 5.1 to an apparent terminal date of 46/5 B.C. Indeed one may well ask whether Diodorus can ever seriously have intended to bring his history to a close with this year. Such an intention could only have become conceivable at some time *after* 46/5 B.C., in other words around the very time that the preface would have been written, which is patently ridiculous: at the time of writing his preface Diodorus had already brought his history to an end with the year 60/59 B.C., and he regarded it as now complete. Moreover, although his figures suggest a terminal date of 46/5 B.C., his words in the same paragraph, "... the beginning of the Celtic War, which we have made the end of our history ..." suggest otherwise. Since one may put more faith in words than in numerical calculation as an expression of intent, we must accept that Diodorus meant ultimately to end his history with the year 60/59 B.C. It is equally clear that he must in the earlier stages have hoped to extend his work to cover the year 54 B.C., a hope subsequently relinquished.

The most plausible answer to the problem of the 1138 years seems to be that Diodorus somehow became entangled in his own chronological calculations. Although he says he has drawn upon Apollodorus, apparently for his entire chronology, Apollodorus' chronology

Egypt incorporated in the Roman Empire, he would surely have mentioned it. However, the point should perhaps not be pressed too far.

¹ Cf. V, 21.2. On the other hand, the reference in XVI, 7.1 to the founding of a Roman colony at Tauromenion, probably in 36 B.C., cannot be taken as evidence that this book, less than halfway through the history, was still being written in 36 B.C. The reference must be a later addition. However, the case is slightly different in that Diodorus obviously had no intention of continuing his history down to 36 B.C., though he must have been revising it at this date or soon after. (But see further below p. 42f.) The same is true of the references to the death of Julius Caesar in V, 21 and 25.

covered only the years from 1184 down to 119 B.C. Diodorus mentions no other chronological source at this point, though he may have used Castor of Rhodes who covered the years down to 60 B.C. But whomever else he used for the purpose, Diodorus would have had to supplement Apollodorus, and it is not inconceivable that in the process of correlating two or more chronologies, he became confused. One solution might be that he was making his calculations in the year 46/5 B.C., and inadvertently worked out the total number of years down to that date, subsequently incorporating the result in his preface. But the most likely solution seems to be simply that Diodorus miscalculated the total number of years from the 1st Olympiad down to the Celtic War—a suggestion made the more plausible by the fact that the historical event which Diodorus ascribes to the last year of his 1138 is in fact none other than the outbreak of the Celtic War. But whatever the reason for the discrepancy, one cannot but indict Diodorus to some extent for carelessness.

CHAPTER 5

5.2 In Book XL, 8 Diodorus says that some of his books were pirated and published before he was satisfied with them. In case they confuse the public, he goes on to give an analysis of the contents of the various books. Of this analysis we have only the opening sentences, but it seems from these to have been similar to the analysis given in I, 4.6f. and I, 5.1.¹

The date of this initial and unofficial publication is unknown. However, St. Jerome records in his *Chronology* under the year 49 B.C., "*Diodorus Siculus Graecae scriptor historiae clarus habetur*", suggesting that part at least of Diodorus' work became public in this year. This can scarcely have been an official publication since Diodorus says in his preface that his history is now complete though unpublished.² But the date of the first official publication is equally uncertain. Since Diodorus refers in I, 4.7 to the deification of Julius

¹ Cf. e.g. with I, 5.1 the words of XL, 8: . . . καὶ τοὺς χρόνους τούτους ἐπ' ἀκρίβειας οὐ διωρισάμεθα διὰ τὸ μὴδὲν παράπηγμα περὶ τούτων παρελθόντων.

² See I, 4.6.

Caesar, it is obvious that the preface must have been written after the year 44 B.C.; and it is probable that it was written before 30 B.C.¹ It would be of interest to narrow down the date of publication, since, if we take seriously Diodorus' statement of I, 4.1 that he has been working on his history for thirty years, it follows that if we could date the preface, we might date the beginning of his researches; and this in turn could well shed some light on his working methods.

If, for example, the preface belongs to a date soon after 44 B.C., then Diodorus must have begun collating material as early as c. 75 B.C. But Book I cannot have been written before 56 B.C.,² and it is therefore open to speculation whether Diodorus wrote his books in the order in which they finally appeared, or whether he completed some of the later books before the earlier ones. The fact that Book I belongs to 56 B.C., and Book III to c. 54 B.C. might suggest the former system: but this would allow an impossibly short time between 56-44 B.C. for Diodorus to complete Books IV-XL. One could only assume that in this case a large part of his material would have had to have been collated and probably written up during the years c. 75-60 B.C. In favour of this theory is perhaps the statement of St. Jerome quoted above. Diodorus' reaction to an unofficial publication of his work might well have been to accelerate the official publication, beginning Book XL soon after 49 B.C., and completing the preface soon after 44 B.C.

On the other hand, a date somewhat later than 44 B.C. for the preface might well allow Diodorus to have written the books more or less in their final order. If the history was published after 36 B.C., that is, after its latest contemporary reference, Diodorus must have begun his researches c. 66 B.C. This would allow him about six years for his preliminary work; a period of about four years in which to travel, particularly to Egypt; and finally a stretch of around twenty years in which to write the history itself, revising and adding to the earlier books as he went along. In favour of this theory is, in particular, the fact that the history as a whole shows little sign of a final, consistent revision and correction. No attempt has been made,

¹ See above, p. 40, n. 3.

² See above, p. 40.

for instance, to remove the references in III, 38.2-3 and V, 21.2 to a projected terminal date of 54 B.C., although the error must surely have been glaringly obviously to Diodorus had he made a thorough revision of his work. It seems rather that he wrote his books roughly in order, occasionally returning to an earlier one to add a new and relevant reference (e.g. to the death of Caesar, to Tauromenion etc.), but that he published his history as soon as he came to the end, before he could attempt a critical revision which would have removed the inconsistencies.¹

CHAPTER 6

6.1-2 Cole, *Democritus and the Sources of Greek Anthropology*, p. 178ff. suggests that these sentences should naturally precede I, 9.3, but that chapters 7 and 8 are interpolated by Diodorus in an attempt "to bridge the gap between the high-sounding rhetoric of the preface and the uninspired collection of excerpts which follows", dealing as they do with the origins of humanity as a whole.

6.3 Aristotle and the early Peripatetics maintained that the universe, including the earth and the human race, was eternal.² The Stoics on the other hand believed in a definite origin in time.³ However, although Diodorus proceeds in the following chapter to describe the origin of the universe in finite time, he does not, as will be seen, appear to be reproducing a specifically Stoic cosmogony.

CHAPTER 7

The exact philosophical source of this chapter (and indeed the following chapter) cannot easily be defined. The most recent and

¹ The date of Diodorus' death is totally unknown, but it is tempting to speculate whether he did not in fact die soon after the publication of his work, before he could correct the discrepancies which must surely have been pointed out to him.

² Aristotle, *Metaph.*, XI, 1072a, 23; 1075b, 33; *De Caelo*, I, 279b, 18ff.; II, 280b, 26. See Lovejoy and Boas, *Primitivism and Related Ideas in Antiquity*, ch. 6. The idea occurs also in Plato and later in Polybius and Lucretius (Guthrie, *In the Beginning*, p. 65f.). It was defended against Zeno, founder of the Stoic school, by Theophrastus (Philo-Judaeus, *De aeternitate mundi*, 23-27). See also Spoerri, *Späthellenistische Berichte*, p. 206.

³ Spoerri, *op. cit.*, p. 206, n. 3.

most comprehensive study of the subject is that of Spoerri's *Spät-hellenistische Berichte über Welt, Kultur und Götter*. His thesis is in essence a refutation of Reinhardt's theory,¹ widely accepted, that this section of Diodorus, like the rest of Book I, is drawn from Hecataeus of Abdera, and by him ultimately from Democritus. Spoerri demonstrates that while superficial or coincidental similarities can be shown to exist between Diodorus' account and other systems, there is no coincidence so specific that one can ascribe Diodorus' cosmogony to any one philosophical school.

As a source, Aristotle and the Peripatetics can be eliminated at once on the basis of their belief in an infinite universe. And in spite of Reinhardt's assertions, the same is true of the Atomists: the chief characteristics of the atomic theory, the atom and infinite space, are totally absent from Diodorus' account, and it is difficult to see how one can maintain an atomic origin for Diodorus' cosmogony when the essentials of atomism are lacking.² On the contrary, Diodorus, who sees the primal situation as a *μεῖγμα*, has more in common here with the Presocratics, particularly Anaximander, Empedocles and Anaxagoras.³

Similarly, Diodorus' account of the origin of the heavenly bodies has nothing in common with that of the Atomists. According to Leucippus and Democritus, the stars had their origin outside the universe, while Diodorus (and it must be admitted that his account is vague at this point), seems to believe that they were formed from the fiery particles within the universe.⁴ In this he agrees with Epi-

¹ "Hekataios von Abdera und Demokrit", *Hermes*, XLVII, 1912, 492-513.

² Spoerri, *op. cit.*, p. 6-30; though there may be some similarity with Epicurus (p. 20-22). Philippson, *Philol. Woch.*, XLIX, 1929, 666-676, following Reinhardt, suggested that references to the atomic theory were removed by Hecataeus since he purported to be giving the Egyptians' theory of philosophy—but this is true only of I, 10, not of I, 6 which gives a general account of the origin of the world, not tied to any particular race.

³ Ap. Aristotle, *Phys.*, A4, 197a, 20f. Cf. also Hesiod, *Theog.*, 154ff. for the separation of Ouranos and Gaia (also Apoll. Rhod., I, 496-8). Morrison, *CQ*, XXXV, 1941, 1-16, agreeing with Dahlmann, *De philosophorum graecorum sententiis*, who opposed Reinhardt's theory, maintains that this passage must be pre-Atomist. Cf. the separation of *σώματα* in Diodorus with Plato, *Tim.*, 52d ff. Cornford, *Plato's Cosmology*, p. 198ff. points out that the latter is pre-Atomist. See also Spoerri, *op. cit.*, p. 16f., 30-33.

⁴ Spoerri, *op. cit.*, p. 25-29.

curus, though this in itself is little indication of his source, since, with the exception of the early Atomists, virtually all the Greek philosophers assumed an intracosmic origin for the heavenly bodies.¹

It is when Spoerri compares Diodorus' cosmogony with that of Ovid *Met.*, I, 5f. that it becomes apparent that both authors are reproducing the thought of their own age.² There are instances of agreement between them which suggest this, though it must also be said that there are certain differences: in particular Diodorus makes no mention of a divine power responsible for the formation of the universe. But, as Spoerri proceeds to demonstrate, the accounts of both Diodorus and Ovid have their roots in the διακρίσεις cosmogonies³ which occur no earlier than the 1st century B.C., and which have their origins in the revival of Platonism at this time.⁴

At the same time it is possible to demonstrate a definite parallel between Diodorus' account of the separation of earth and heaven, apparently by the action of the air, and Egyptian cosmology. In one version of the latter, Heaven and Earth (Nut and Geb) are forcibly separated by the action of their father, Air (Shu).⁵ This does not, however, necessarily have any bearing on the question of Diodorus' source.

As with the cosmogony, the zoogony of the latter half of this chapter cannot be ascribed to any particular early philosophy although certain details of it are known to have existed in earlier times. For example, the effect of warmth on moisture is already known to the Presocratics,⁶ while evidence suggesting that the concept of "terrestrial wombs" originated with Democritus is summarized by Philippsen, *Philol. Woch.*, XLIX, 1929, 672f.⁷ But the concept of spontaneous generation was well-known in the ancient

¹ Spoerri, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

² Spoerri, *op. cit.*, p. 34-38.

³ According to which the four elements are separated out from original chaos.

⁴ Spoerri, *op. cit.*, p. 114-117.

⁵ Erman, *Die Religion der Aegypter*, p. 62; Cornford, *Principium Sapientiae*, p. 186 and n.

⁶ Spoerri, p. 127, n. 4; Guthrie, *In the Beginning*, p. 30ff.; cf. Censorinus, *de die natali*, IV, 9 (on Anaximander).

⁷ But Democritus as a direct source is discarded by Spoerri, p. 123-6. For a description of the activity of marsh-gas, see Guthrie, *op. cit.*, p. 120, n. 7.

world,¹ and, as with the cosmogony, the zoogony seems to be a product of Diodorus' own era;² though Diodorus is not unaware that his account is apparently in agreement with that held by Euripides, a pupil of Anaxagoras.³ Certainly, as Spoerri points out, it is unlikely that it comes from Hecataeus' *Aegyptiaca*, as Reinhardt believed: it differs from I, 10 in that it is a general theory of the origin of life, while I, 10 describes not how, but why mankind first came into existence in Egypt.

CHAPTER 8

The earliest Greek concepts of the origin of mankind show a general tendency towards primitivism, or a belief in the ideal and happy state of primitive man, expressed mythologically as the Golden Age. From this happy state the development of man is seen as a gradual decline.⁴ At about the same time, or perhaps a little later, exactly the opposite point of view began to gain acceptance: according to this, the life of primitive man was a state of misery, from which mankind has steadily progressed. This progress is ultimately dependent on some culture-bringer, whether man or god.

It is widely held that Democritus was the first to replace the concept of the Golden Age with the belief in a primitive state of misery. Thus Pohlenz, *Die Stoa*, p. 235 says: "Dem romantischen Traum von einem goldenen Zeitalter hatte Demokrit das Bild eines tierähnlichen Urzustandes entgegengestellt, aus dem der Mensch sich erst allmählich emporgearbeitet habe, indem er unter dem Zwange der Not seine geistigen Fähigkeiten entwickelte."⁵ How-

¹ Capelle, "Das Problem der Urzeugung bei Aristoteles und Theophrast", *Rh. Mus.*, LXXXVIII, 1955, 150-180. Sextus Empiricus, *Pyrh. Hypotyp.*, I, 41 gives a list of creatures so generated, together with the various substances from which they were believed to derive.

² Spoerri, p. 117-129. Cf. particularly Ovid, *Met.*, I, 416f., and the XIVth century Johannes Catrares who must, according to Guthrie, *op. cit.*, p. 60, have drawn largely upon the same early sources as Diodorus.

³ Nauck, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, 484.

⁴ Such is the idea found particularly in Homer and Hesiod, and especially in the latter, who noted five successive ages of man: Gold, Silver, Bronze, Demi-gods and Iron (*Works and Days*, 106-175).

⁵ Assuming that the Hippocratic *περὶ ἀρχαῆς ἰητρικῆς* is later than Democritus.

ever, it seems probable that the idea, a product of Ionian rationalism, manifested itself much earlier, only coming to full flower in the Vth-IVth centuries B.C. with the increase in philosophical speculation.¹ Certainly there is evidence for it as early as Hesiod,² where there occurs the myth of Prometheus, who tried to improve the life of man, thereby incurring the wrath of the gods; but the story is not adequately integrated with the theory of the Ages. Similar ideas can be found in the Homeric Hymns and in Aeschylus and Euripides, but again in mythological rather than philosophical settings. From the Vth century onwards the theory was widely, though not unanimously, accepted, and it is this which forms the basis of Diodorus' account.

The origin of civilization was a subject which greatly attracted the late-Hellenistic writers, and the Romans in particular.³ The general consensus of opinion is that most of these accounts are indebted to Posidonius, who is known from Seneca's *Epistle*, XC to have been regarded as an expert on the subject of cultural history. But there is no proof that he was their source. In fact it seems probable that Posidonius was attempting to combine a progressive or evolutionary theory of culture with the Stoic concept of a Golden Age: at any rate there is no definite evidence to suggest that he proposed an earlier stage of savagery.⁴

In Diodorus the "culture-bringer" is man himself (rather than a deity such as Hephaestus or Prometheus), inasmuch as man learns from his own experience. Thus men are led by experience to band together to defend themselves from the attacks of wild beasts.⁵ The

¹ Lovejoy and Boas, *Primitivism and Related Ideas in Antiquity*, chs. 5 and 6 on Plato and Aristotle, ch. 7 on anti-primitivism in Greek literature. See also Cole, *Democritus and the Sources of Greek Anthropology*, p. 1ff.

² *Works and Days*, 43-105.

³ For references see Spoerri, p. 133f.

⁴ Uxkull-Gyllenband, *Griechische Kultur-Entstehungslehren*, p. 44ff. Pfligersdorffer, *Studien zu Poseidonios* (Sitzb. Öst. Ak. Phil. hist. Kl., 232/5, 1959) argues that these chapters in Diodorus (I, 7f.) do in fact go back to Posidonius, but he is opposed by Spoerri, *Mus. Helv.*, XVIII, 1961, 63. Gigon, *Arch. J. Gesch. d. Philos.*, XLIV, 1962, 97 maintains that although there is no definite proof, the attribution to Posidonius is the most likely.

⁵ Cf. Plato, *Protag.*, 322. A similar account is found in Diodorus I, 90, where bands of men are said to have united to defend themselves not against animals, but against stronger groups.

direct outcome of this, according to Diodorus, was the development of speech.

As far as the origins of speech are concerned, Spoerri notes the existence of two main theories; the "Physistheorie" of natural development, held mainly by the Epicureans; and the "Thesistheorie" which at the time of Diodorus was of greater significance. Although he admits that Diodorus does not explicitly commit himself, he believes him to be hinting at a "Thesistheorie."¹ But Diodorus' account appears to be so eclectic that it is difficult to make even this distinction.

In I, 8. 5-9, as in I, 8. 1f., Diodorus maintains that it was from experience and expediency that mankind learned to guard against the future and to better their own existence. Such a concept was common in antiquity.² It is found both among the early Greeks, particularly Democritus,³ and later among Epicurean and Stoic writers alike. The similarities between Lucretius V, 925-30, 942-4, 988-1009 and Diodorus led Bailey to suggest that Lucretius is following Diodorus closely in his account of primitive life, and that the passage in Diodorus is Epicurean in origin. Guthrie,⁴ however, notices certain differences, and concludes that both Diodorus and Lucretius were probably making their choice from among a variety of traditions, some of which were much older than Epicurus.⁵

Whether or not chapters 7 and 8 both come from a single source is debatable.⁶ Whether in addition they originally formed an integral part of the *theologoumena* (I, 10-29) is a still more difficult problem.

¹ Spoerri, p. 134-141. This was already noted by Vlastos, "On the Pre-history in Diodorus", *AJP*, LXVII, 1946, 51-9, who, following Reinhardt, believes this chapter to represent the point of view of Democritus, with whom the "Thesistheorie" appears to have originated. See also Cole, *Democritus*, p. 67f.

² For references see Spoerri, p. 144-8.

³ Vlastos, *op. cit.*

⁴ *In the Beginning*, p. 137, n. 19.

⁵ Guthrie is more inclined to compare Diodorus with the IVth century Peripatetic Dicaearchus (*op. cit.*, p. 74-8).

⁶ Cole, *op. cit.*, p. 183: certain inconsistencies suggest a composite source (Spoerri, p. 114f.), though Cole would prefer to believe that the chapters simply come from different parts of the same source.

This suggestion was originally propounded by Reinhardt.¹ His theory is that these two chapters appeared in Diodorus' source as a native version of cosmogony and prehistory given by the priests as a preface to their account of the earliest life in Egypt. He bases his suggestion on the close connection between the material contained in chapters 7 and 8 and that of the *theologoumena*.² Moreover these two sections complement each other to such an extent that what now appear as chapters 7 and 8 must once have been part of the *Aegyptiaca* in Diodorus' source: which in turn must be regarded as a specifically Egyptian *archaeologia*. From this context chapters 7 and 8 were detached by Diodorus to form part of his (non-Egyptian) general introduction. But it seems likely that the *archaeologia* was itself the result of the Egyptianization of an earlier general *Kulturgeschichte*. In other words the material in chapters 7 and 8 has been moved from a general context in the original source to an Egyptian setting in the intermediate source, and has finally been restored to its non-Egyptian setting by Diodorus.

In defence of Reinhardt's Theory, Cole argues that the *Kulturgeschichten* found in Vitruvius (33. 16-23), Diodorus, Tzetzes in *Hesiod Works and Days* (VS, II, 137, 36-138, 13), Lucretius V and Posidonius ap. Seneca, *Ep.*, XC all ultimately derive from a common source.³ He inclines to the view of Reinhardt that this original source may be Democritus, but admits that any identification must be uncertain—in fact the concordance of ideas among the five authors may argue in favour of a source less remote in time. He suggests Epicurus, whose writings were kept alive in the 1st century B.C., or perhaps a Hellenistic author "whose name is not remembered in connection with *Kulturgeschichte* at all." In fact, Cole concludes,⁴ the most probable date of Diodorus' source is around 300 B.C.

Spoerri, on the other hand, maintains that the ideas contained in these chapters belong to no one theory of the origin of civilization.

¹ "Hekataios von Abdera und Demokrit", *Hermes*, XLVII, 1912, 495-8. See also Cole, *op. cit.*, p. 16, 174, 188f.

² Cf. e.g. the need to relate the ἐκπράξεις of ch. 10 with the process described in ch. 7.

³ *Democritus*, p. 25-46.

⁴ p. 159.

Indeed, he believes that they do not even give a uniform impression:¹ he separates I, 8.1-4, which deal with the formation of human society and with the origin of speech, from I, 8.5-9 which deal with the improvement of man's condition and the beginning of culture. It is therefore unlikely, in his view, that chapter 8 is from Hecataeus.² Moreover it hardly accords with the Egyptian point of view that early man should have been driven into caves by the cold.³ The passage must, in Spoerri's view, reflect the thought of Diodorus' own time—there are differences, but these are minimal. And whatever his source or sources. Diodorus avoids everything that would betray a coherent philosophical point of view.

CHAPTER 9

9.2f. Jacoby, *FGrH*, 70, F 109 comm. suggests that these sentences, which establish "warum E(phorus) auf die geschichte des alten orientes so gut wie auf die der griechischen heroenzeit verzichtete", should be ascribed to Ephorus himself. Certainly in his preface Ephorus stated that the stories of the remote past were outside his province, because their truth could not be ascertained, though he did not entirely avoid the early legends.⁴ He began his history with the Return of the Heracleidae (the Dorian Invasion) some time in the Xth century. The first five books formed a general introduction to the whole work: books I-III giving an historical and geographical account of early Greece, and the two following books dealing with world geography, before the history of Greece is resumed in book VI.⁵ It may be to this arrangement that Diodorus is referring in

¹ *Späthellenistische Berichte*, p. 162f. Cole, *op. cit.*, p. 187.

² However, it must be admitted that Cole's theory could admit this possibility: from a general non-Egyptian *Kulturgeschichte*, the material might have been incorporated by Hecataeus into his *Aegyptiaca*. But this presupposes that Hecataeus did not use Egyptian material for his work. Moreover Cole suggests a date of 300 B.C. for the *original* source.

³ An idea which, however, would suit Reinhardt/Cole's theory of the non-Egyptian setting of the ultimate source. It may further be said that this chapter differs from I, 14.1 in that in the latter it is Osiris who is said to have improved the lot of mankind.

⁴ Barber, *The Historian Ephorus*, p. 144ff.

⁵ Barber, p. 26-31.

I, 9.5 when he says that he will deal with the barbarians at the outset, so that he will not have to interrupt his narrative on the Greeks to explain a point connected with an outside race.

9.3 Cf. Plato, *Timaeus*, 22B ff., where the Egyptian priest tells Solon that the Greeks never become old as a race, because the regular destructions of the earth allow only an unlettered few to survive, interrupting the transmission of tradition. The Egyptian traditions on the other hand are of great antiquity. It is implied, though not explicitly stated¹, that the Egyptians are the most ancient race, while the Greeks are allowed to be the noblest and most perfect race among men.

9.6 Observations of the stars in Egypt were certainly early (we have evidence from around 2000 B.C.) but probably no earlier than those in Mesopotamia.²

CHAPTER 10

10.1 According to Herodotus II, 2, it was the belief of the Egyptians themselves that they were the oldest human race, until Psammetichus proved otherwise. However, it is unlikely that the Egyptians ever relinquished their claim, and the Greeks themselves seem to have upheld it.³

For the plants mentioned here, see below ch. 34.

10.2 Belief in the spontaneous generation of mice⁴ has always been widespread. It seems to be bound up with the idea that the Egyptians were the oldest race, and the fact that the Greeks believed that Nile water, combined with the εὐκρασία of the land, formed ideal conditions for the production of life. The belief was still prevalent in the XVIIth century, when Alexander Ross criticized Sir Thomas Browne for doubting the possibility of spontaneous gener-

¹ See however below, ch. 10.1 where the Egyptians are said by their own reckoning to be the oldest race.

² See below ch. 81.4.

³ Plato, *Timaeus*, 22f. Cf. Aristotle, *Meteor.*, 352b, 21: οὓς γὰρ φαμεν ἀρχαιοτάτους εἶναι τῶν ἀνθρώπων Αἰγυπτίους, τούτων ἡ χώρα πᾶσα γεγонуῖα φαίνεται καὶ οὐσα τοῦ ποταμοῦ ἔργον. Cf. also Aristotle, *Politics*, VII, 9.5, 1329b.

⁴ See also above, ch. 7.

ation, saying, "Let him go to Egypt, and there he will find the fields swarming with mice, begot of the mud of Nylus to the great calamity of the inhabitants." And W. R. Dawson, "The Mouse in Egyptian and Later Medicine", *JEA*, X, 1924, 83-86, reports that the present-day Egyptians still believe in the spontaneous generation of mice.¹ It is possibly because of its association with the Nile that the mouse acquired its virtue of giving life. Throughout history mice have been given to children *in extremis* and there are early (i.e. predynastic) instances of bodies, in the alimentary tracts of which mice have been found.²

10.4 The Greeks apparently believed that more than one flood had occurred in the history of the earth. In Plato, *Timaeus*, 23B, the Egyptian priest tells Solon that in fact many floods have occurred at regular intervals: οἱ πρῶτον μὲν ἓνα γῆς κατακλυσμὸν μέμνησθε πολλῶν ἔμπροσθεν γεγονότων . . . And Aristotle, *Meteor.*, I, 14, 352a says, αὕτη (ὑπερβολὴ ὕμβρων) δὲ οὐκ ἄει κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς τόπους ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ὁ καλούμενος ἐπὶ Δευκαλίωνος κατακλυσμός· καὶ γὰρ οὗτος περὶ τὸν Ἑλληνικὸν ἐγένετο τόπον μάλιστα, καὶ τούτου περὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα τὴν ἀρχαίαν.

The best known version of the story of the flood is to be found in Genesis VI-IX. This, though written during the VIIIth century B.C., is almost certainly based on an earlier tradition. Similarly the Epic of Gilgamesh, which also contains a record of a flood, belongs to a much earlier date. In India the story of the flood belongs not to the Vedic hymns, but to the Sanskrit Shatapatha Brahmana (VIth century B.C.).

In the Greek story of Deucalion, Greece alone is submerged, and in general Plato and the Stoics seem to have been aware only of a partial flood, not a complete submergence of the entire world. Diodorus mentions this latter possibility, which may have been a product of increased speculation in this field.³ Africa, including Egypt, appears not to have known the legend, although Egypt enjoyed close contact with the Babylonians. Deucalion can have had no connection with Egypt, and the only vague reference to such a

¹ See also Wilson in *Before Philosophy* (H. Frankfort and others), p. 58.

² Dawson, *loc. cit.*

³ Spoerri, *Späthellenistische Berichte*, p. 208f.

connection occurs in Pseudo-Plutarch, *Pro Nobilitate*, III: 'Ανακαλεῖς με πρὸς τοὺς πάλαι χρόνους· ἄρα εἰς Δευκαλίωνος ἢ τὰ παρὰ Χαλδαίοις καὶ Αἰγυπτίοις ἐκδεδομένα;

Archaeological evidence suggests that the basis of the legend was catastrophic flooding in the Tigris-Euphrates basin, probably around 3,000 B.C. It is probable that there was more than one flood, although there may well have been one which surpassed the rest in the extent of its destruction. It could have been caused initially by the rising of the two rivers, augmented by torrential rain (Gen. VII, 4, 12), if not also by a tidal bore (Gen. VII, 11).

CHAPTER II

It is difficult for us to understand the Egyptian conception of religion.¹ Like most ancient peoples, the Egyptians felt no need of logic or consistency in the structure of their religion, which depended rather upon the individual for its interpretation and meaning than upon dogmatism. Moreover the roots of their religion lie in the distant past and are for the most part undocumented.

In the early stages of its development, Egypt was probably inhabited by a number of tribes, each with its own god or gods (often represented as a fetish or animal).² With the gradual unification of the tribes and the establishment of a settled civilization, certain gods became predominant, but the characteristics of the others, though overshadowed, were not entirely lost. The Egyptians did not discard elements of religion which proved incompatible, but rather retained them as different aspects of one truth. The Egyptian religion thus increased in complexity as the political circumstances of the country changed. And although at different periods one god might appear to be dominant, as local gods were promoted to state gods (e.g. Amūn at Thebes), no god could ever entirely replace nor even displace the polytheistic accretion of the centuries.

From the evidence, interpreted by Baumgartel, *The Cultures of*

¹ See Černý, *Ancient Egyptian Religion*; Frankfort, *Ancient Egyptian Religion; Kingship and the Gods*; Jéquier, *Considerations sur les religions égyptiennes*; Morenz, *Ägyptische Religion*; Vandier, *La religion égyptienne*.

² See below, ch. 86.

Prehistoric Egypt, it appears that the Badarians, the bearers of the earliest culture in Egypt, worshipped a mother goddess. She was venerated in the form of a cow, together with her son represented as a young bull, embodying the fertile principle.¹ The worship of a fertility goddess continued under the Naqada I culture, but there is also evidence of animal worship, and possibly of tree worship.² The existence of the god Seth³ is less well attested at this date, but is just possible. Under the Naqada II culture there is positive evidence for the worship of Min, who appears to have been the particular fertility god of this people. Little is seen of Seth at this period.⁴ The most important new god, however, is the falcon Horus. From the representations of him crouching on a crescent moon, it seems probable that he was in origin a sky-god: there is nothing to show that he was ever considered to be a sun-god.

Thus the nature of the early predynastic religion was essentially chthonic. Only at the end of the Naqada II period did a sky religion emerge with its sky-god Horus.⁵ Sun worship and the conception of a heavenly hereafter seem to have developed comparatively late, and there is no evidence that the sun-god Rē' existed in the predynastic period. Heliopolis, the centre of sun worship, did not exist as such in the predynastic period:⁶ the earliest temple discovered there dates from the time of Djoser (IIIrd Dyn.), and it was not until the IVth and Vth Dyns. that the power of Heliopolis began appreciably to increase.

The growth of the solar religion must have been fairly slow: the incorporation of the name Rē' in the royal titulary does not become

¹ Baumgartel, *op. cit.*, I, p. 23; II, p. 149.

² Baumgartel, I, p. 36f.

³ See below ch. 21.

⁴ Baumgartel, I, p. 46f.

⁵ Wainwright, *The Sky Religion in Egypt*, also believes that the early religion of Egypt was a sky religion, working on the precept that in hot climates the sun is an enemy, while the sky as the giver of rain is far more important. He therefore sees Seth as a storm-god prominent at an early date, and Horus as a sky-god formed by the fusion of a pre-dynastic sky-god with a hawk-god. Moreover, since he believes it was the duty of the early kings to be sacrificed for the benefit and fertility of their people, he sees the introduction of solar worship as a deliberate attempt on the part of certain kings to avoid their fate.

⁶ Baumgartel, *op. cit.*, I, ch. 3.

common until the Vth and VIth Dyns. It is true that one king of the IIInd Dyn. apparently bore the name Neferkarē', but Gardiner, *Egypt of the Pharaohs*, p. 416, suggests that it may be fictitious, on the grounds that the very inclusion of the reference to Rē' seems to point to a later date. Whatever the logic of this argument, the kings of the first dynasties commonly took Horus-names. By the end of the IIInd Dyn., one king bore a Seth-name, while his successor took a dual Horus- and Seth-name, indicating that the earlier religion was still powerful. Sun worship must, however, have been well established by the IVth Dyn., as it is then that the first true pyramid, a sun symbol, appears.

II.1 What made mankind first believe in the existence of the gods was a question which exercised the Greeks from the time of the Sophists onwards. Prodicus¹ believed that mankind deified the most useful aspects of nature; Democritus² that men were moved to religion through fear of natural phenomena; Plato³ that they were led to believe in gods because of the order of the universe, an idea continued by Aristotle. But the question was most systematically investigated by the Stoics.

Clearly Diodorus' attitude can in no way be compared with that of Prodicus. But Spoerri⁴ would also maintain that there is no greater similarity between Diodorus and Democritus: this can hardly be accepted. The difference between the awe with which Diodorus says men were struck in the face of the heavens, and the fear of natural phenomena to which Democritus ascribes religion is far from great. Spoerri sees a closer relationship between Diodorus and Aristotle, whose views were by now widely diffused. But the most one can say is that there is nothing in Diodorus which is inconsistent with the thought of his own time.

II.1f. The origins of Osiris and his religion have long provided material for argument among scholars, and Osiris has been variously described as a god of the dead, a vegetation god, or a deified human

¹ Sext. Emp., *Adv. Math.*, IX, 18.

² Sext. Emp., *op. cit.*, IX, 24.

³ *Laws*, X, 898ff.

⁴ *op. cit.*, p. 164-169.

king.¹ J. Gwyn Griffiths, in *The Origins of Osiris*, the most recent and most exhaustive study of the subject, believes that the god is in origin the god of the royal dead.

Even the date of origin of the Osirian religion cannot be established with any certainty. There is no evidence for it in predynastic times, since Osiris does not appear on the tribal standards or predynastic palettes.² The earliest positive evidence occurs at the end of the Vth Dyn. with the Pyramid Texts.³ However, this does not preclude the possibility that "as the mythological form of the deceased ruler, he (sc. Osiris) was worshipped at Abydos, under the Ist Dynasty and probably earlier."⁴ It is from Abydos that the god appears to have emanated,⁵ but in all probability he was regarded as the god of the royal necropolis there, not of Abydos itself or its temple.⁶ It is possible that Osiris, like Anubis and Khentimenty, was at first a jackal-god.⁷ In this case he must have become anthropomorphic through his association with the dead king. This association was probably the result of an impulse to convert fear of the god of the dead into a form of divine protection for the dead king.

¹ See in particular *Man*, XXXVII, 1937, 186; XLVIII, 1948, 83f.; Sethe, *Urgeschichte und älteste Religion der Ägypter*, p. 79, n. 3, maintains that Osiris was an ancient king subsequently deified. Gardiner, *JEA*, XLVI, 1960, 104 believes this to be highly improbable. He thinks that the origin of Osiris is an insoluble mystery, but describes his later status as "the personification of dead kingship", an idea already postulated by Frankfort, *Kingship and the Gods*. According to Breasted, *Development*, however, Osiris is essentially and originally a vegetation and fertility god.

² Baumgartel, *Cultures*, I, p. 4f.

³ Griffiths, *Osiris*, p. 21.

⁴ Griffiths, p. 114. Indeed, elements of the Pyramid Texts may well go back beyond this date.

⁵ Griffiths, p. 37, 114f. Kees, *Totenglauben*, p. 136ff. believes that the original cult was established at Busiris, but the Pyramid Texts may suggest an earlier connection with Abydos, since references to Abydos outnumber those to Busiris. There is little evidence for the fusion of Osiris and Andjety at Busiris at an early date, though this is often assumed; it is perhaps more likely that the dead king provided the medium for this association. But the epithet "Lord of Busiris" is frequent from the Vth Dyn. onwards.

⁶ Griffiths, p. 86.

⁷ Griffiths, p. 92f., 125. Osiris appears as a jackal in certain Pyramid Texts. (Cf. Diodorus I, 88.6 where Osiris is said to have come from Hades in the form of a wolf.)

From here it is only a short step to equate the dead king with Osiris, thus ensuring his immortality.¹

According to Griffiths² Osiris had originally no connection with water or vegetation. It is clear from the Pyramid Texts that Sothis and Orion were seen by the ancient Egyptians as symbols of fertility because the dog star was the forerunner of the inundation, and Osiris was probably brought into contact with the Nile and the renewal of growth by association with Sothis and Orion. This is in direct opposition to the stages of development in the spread of the Osirian religion envisaged by Breasted.³ For him Osiris is first and foremost a vegetation god. At Busiris he replaces a god-king, Andjety, and becomes himself a god-king. With the spread of his cult to Memphis he assimilates Sokaris, an underworld force associated with Ptah, thus assuming funerary associations. On his introduction at Abydos he supercedes Khentiamenty, god of the dead, and himself becomes firmly established as god of the underworld and afterlife. These stages are reversed by Griffiths, who finds the earliest possible association of Osiris with corn in the Ramesseum Dramatic Papyrus,⁴ in a scene where Seth is represented as an ass, Osiris as barley, and Horus commands Seth not to beat his father (apparently a reference to the threshing of grain, often done by asses).⁵

From the New Kingdom onwards "corn-Osiris" figures were made, in the form of a mummy, from bruised corn and earth. These were buried with the dead, or in the grain fields to ensure a plentiful crop.⁶ What appears to be a predecessor of these effigies, a matting

¹ Griffiths, p. 41f. This is the strength of the Osirian religion: while other systems involved the ascent of the dead to heaven or their transformation into different forms, the Osirian religion provided for the continued existence of the dead king. The process of embalming seems to be linked in origin with the cult of Osiris at Abydos (Griffiths, p. 36).

² Griffiths, p. 96-114.

³ *Development of Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt*.

⁴ Sethe, *Dramatische Texte*, 134ff.

⁵ Cf. also the Ritual of Amenophis III (Fakhry, "A Note on the Tomb of Kheruef at Thebes", *ASAE*, XLII, 1943, 449-508); Blackman and Fairman, *JEA*, XXXV, 1949, 98-112; XXXVI, 1950, 63-81; Lacau, "Textes religieux" *Rec. Trav.* XXXI, 1909, 15f., where Osiris is identified, though loosely, with the corn-god Neper.

⁶ Frankfort, *Kingship and the Gods*, p. 185f.; Gardiner, *The Tomb of*

litter covered with grain in the husk, has been discovered in a tomb probably of the IIInd Dyn. at Saqqâra,¹ perhaps symbolizing a general belief that death and rebirth in nature have some connection with human death. But since the Osirian religion is not attested for the IIInd Dyn., it suggests that the symbolic approach to vegetation was originally independent of the cult of Osiris. As god of the dead, Osiris would need the power to renew life in the dead, so that his connection with vegetation and fertility would be a secondary feature, a late assimilation of a belief which had already arisen outside the context of his cult.

Nevertheless, it is as god of the underworld that Osiris appears in the Pyramid Texts. By the end of the Vth Dyn. the dead king was considered to be one with Osiris. By the Middle Kingdom every dead person became identified with Osiris. The religion once confined to the king had now spread to the people, promising to all men the chance at least of everlasting life. At the same time Osiris began to usurp certain of the functions of Rē'.

Many of the solar beliefs were now incorporated into the Osirian religion, although the sun-god retained his separate cult as Amon-Rē' until the Ptolemaic period. In the New Kingdom the aspect of Osiris and Isis as fertility gods was increasingly emphasized, and they became more concerned with the world of the living, in addition to the underworld. Osiris was by now associated with both the sun and the moon as well as with the star Orion. And as the character of Osiris changed, so the myths surrounding him became more complicated. Popular mythology attempted to include as many as possible of the diverse features of the Osirian myth in a story which would render the Osirian religion comprehensible. This attempt is known to us only from Greek authors, principally Plutarch.² But although no Egyptian account survives in full, elements of the Greek version can be confirmed from Egyptian texts as far back as the Pyramid Texts.

Briefly the popular story is as follows: Osiris was born on the

Amenemhet, p. 115. See also a vignette of P. Jumilhac in Vandier, *Le Papyrus Jumilhac*, pl. III.

¹ Griffiths, p. 109f.

² *De Iside et Osiride*.

first of the intercalary days as the son of Rhea and Cronus (i.e. Nut and Geb, heaven and earth). He married his sister Isis. He succeeded to the earthly kingdom of his father, and according to both Diodorus¹ and Plutarch, rescued the Egyptians from their uncivilized way of life, showing them the fruits of cultivation and giving them law and religion. This is confirmed by a text from the XVIIIth Dyn.²: "He established justice in Egypt, putting the son in the seat of the father", and "he overthrew his enemies, and with a mighty arm he slew his foes, setting the fear of him among his adversaries, and extending his boundaries." The Egyptian text thus indicates that his rule was not entirely peaceful, whereas the Greek version maintains that he won men over by charm, song and music until he had civilized the whole earth. According to the hymn, Isis remained at his side; but in the Greek version she was entrusted with the rule of Egypt during her husband's absence on his civilizing expedition.

The arch enemy of Osiris was his brother Seth, called by the Greeks Typhon,³ who with his followers plotted against Osiris.⁴ There is evidence of the latter's assassination in the Pyramid Texts, but not in the form given by the Greek authors. There is, however, a reference to drowning in the Pyramid Texts (24d, 615d, 766d) and on the British Museum Stele 797, ll.19 and 62: "Osiris was drowned in his water."⁵ There is no trace in the Egyptian sources of the Greek tradition that he was lured into a chest and shut in to die, although the casting of the chest into the river may echo the Egyptian version of drowning.⁶ The body of Osiris was sought far and wide by Isis and her sister Nephthys, until it was found on

¹ Griffiths, p. 114, n. 105 believes this to be the first record of this concept, and to be derived from the cult of Dionysus.

² Hymn to Osiris in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Stele 20, publ. Ledrain, *Les monuments égyptiens de la Bibliothèque Nationale* (1897), pl. xxi-xxviii.

³ See below ch. 21. Cf. Herod. II, 144.

⁴ Seth does not become the murderer of Osiris until the confusion of the myths of Horus and Osiris. Strictly speaking he has no part in the Osirian mythology, belonging to the earlier Horus-Seth cycle (see below ch. 21.3).

⁵ See Griffiths, *Osiris*, p. 104, where it is suggested that "his" means "Ptah's", and refers to the transferring of the drowning of Osiris from Abydos to the Nile near Memphis.

⁶ For the divine effects of drowning, see Kees, "Apotheosis by Drowning", in *Studies Presented to F. Ll. Griffith*; Morenz, "Zur Vergöttlichung in Ägypten".

the shores of Nedyt.¹ In the Egyptian sources, the body was then embalmed either by the two sisters or by Anubis, the mortuary god sent for this purpose.² In the Greek tradition, Seth rediscovered the body of Osiris already rescued once by Isis, and dismembered it, scattering the fragments. Isis again sought out the severed limbs and buried them wherever she found them. Presumably this episode of the story developed at a later date from the claim of a number of towns to possess a relic of the divine body. And yet there may be an obscure reference to the dismemberment of Osiris in the Pyramid Texts, (1981): "A libation for you is poured out by Isis, [Nephthys has cleansed you, even your two] great and mighty sisters who gathered your flesh together, who raised up your members . . ." But this may equally well refer only to the normal results of decay. Certainly all other references to dismemberment are very late.³

Osiris was ultimately avenged by his son Horus (conceived by Isis of her dead husband), who attacked Seth and finally overcame him. His victory was ratified by a tribunal of the gods who vindicated Osiris and punished Seth.⁴ Osiris was thus resurrected and restored to his kingdom. The connection of Osiris with vegetation, his destruction by dismemberment, and his final resurrection made his religion the more comprehensible to the Greeks, who saw in it elements of their own myths of Dionysus⁵ and Pentheus.

The popularity of the Osirian religion may well stem from the fact that Osiris, with his devoted wife Isis and his avenging son Horus, represented the ideal of family life, and as such appealed to the human emotions. The actions of the myth could be understood ten", *ZAS*, LXXXIV, 1959, 132-143, esp. p. 140f., where earlier studies are summarized. However, as Te Velde, *Seth God of Confusion*, p. 85f., points out, death by drowning can hardly be considered a *natural* or probable death for a Nile god, but must rather be seen as another aspect of the murder of Osiris by Seth. But, as has been seen, Griffiths denies that Osiris is a Nile god.

¹ Pyr., 1008, 1256 etc. Frankfort, *Kingship*, p. 191.

² Pyr., 1257f., 1981 etc.

³ Vandier, *Jumilhac*, p. 99f. But *cf.* Pyr., 1789: "I have put my brother together, I have reassembled his members." The evidence for dismemberment is discussed by Bonnet, *Reallexikon*, s.v. Leichenzerstückelung.

⁴ See below ch. 21.

⁵ See below ch. 22.7.

and imitated on a human plane, thus providing a moral aspect for the religion. It is difficult to distinguish between the Greek and Egyptian traditions in Diodorus, because of the great similarity between the stories of Osiris and Dionysus. The Pyramid Texts give only the outline of a myth which was later expanded. By Alexandrian times Greek syncretism was in full swing, and the stories of the two gods must have become to a certain extent interchanged. Nevertheless, the picture which Diodorus gives of the Osirian religion as a religion of the people is basically accurate. The endowment of Osiris with a definite human personality and a family life, his benefits to mankind and his beneficent rule endeared him to the people, while his survival of death and his resurrection opened up to all the chance of life after death.

II.1f. The origin of the goddess Isis is obscure, but from the manner in which her name was written (𓆎 , 3rd, seat), it is probable that she represented the deification of the throne of Osiris.¹ She apparently originated in the Delta north of Busiris, but there is no reference to her possible origin in any myth of the historical period.²

At an early date Isis became the wife of Osiris. In the Pyramid Texts her most important act is the recovery and burial of the body of the murdered Osiris after her long mourning and wandering throughout the country. The brief outline of this which can be elicited from the Pyramid Texts is much embellished by the time of Plutarch, who gives a still more detailed version of the story than does Diodorus. Here Isis appears as the helper of Osiris in his campaign to civilize Egypt, teaching women to grind corn, spin and weave, and imparting to mankind the art of healing.³ When Osiris

¹ But see Frankfort, *Ancient Egyptian Religion*, p. 6.

² Isis does, however, have a part to play in the transition from the early solar to the Osirian religion, according to a New Kingdom papyrus. Rē' is represented as an old man dribbling on the earth. From the mud thus formed Isis models a serpent which bites Rē'. Isis refuses to save Rē' from death until he confesses his true name. This Rē' finally does, but in revealing his name he surrenders his power to Isis, who thus achieves supreme power over the other gods (Pleyte-Rossi, *Les papyrus de Turin*, pl. 31, 77, 131-8; Léfèbvre, *ZAS*, XXI, 1883, 27-33).

³ Isis appears frequently as a magician and healer (see below ch. 25.6).

leaves Egypt to civilize the world, Isis is left behind to govern Egypt. Nevertheless the sorrowing of Isis and her protracted search for her murdered husband remained the most important part of the legend and in Roman times was commemorated annually in a festival.¹

As the wife of Osiris, Isis became the most important goddess of the Egyptian pantheon as the Osirian religion gained favour in Egypt, and she quickly absorbed or became identified with other goddesses, taking upon herself their attributes as she did so. Thus she became identified with the cow as a direct result of her confusion with Hathor.²

Under Ptolemaic and Roman domination, the cult of Isis spread far beyond the bounds of Egypt, throughout the civilized world. She became the embodiment of the universal goddess, as can be seen from the numerous hymns to Isis that have been discovered.³ The Greeks had already identified her with their own Demeter, the corn-goddess, probably because of her association with Osiris as a vegetation god. But she came to represent in particular the faithful wife and devoted mother. As the latter she was often depicted suckling the infant Horus,⁴ and in such representations she was later frequently mistaken for the Madonna with child.⁵

As the fame of Isis spread, the importance of Osiris waned, and was left far behind. He was largely replaced, at least in Alexandria and outside Egypt, by the god Sarapis.⁶ In Egypt, however, Osiris maintained his position, even gaining a new lease of life as Osiris-Canopus. Sarapis, apparently an artificial introduction of the time of Ptolemy, intended to be worshipped by Greeks and Egyptians alike, borrowed a few of his attributes from Osiris, but most of his characteristics were Hellenistic. This god in turn was associated

¹ See below ch. 14.3.

² See below ch. 11.4.

³ For refs. see below ch. 27. See also Müller, *Ägypten und die griechischen Isis-Aretalogien*, p. 86f.

⁴ Müller, "Die stillende Gottesmutter in Ägypten", *Materia Medica Nordmark*, 2, Sonderheft 1963; "Isis mit dem Horuskinde", *Münchener Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst*, XIV, 1963, 7-38.

⁵ Černý, *Ancient Egyptian Religion*, p. 148.

⁶ See below ch. 25.1.

with Isis, who by now had her own temples, priests and mysteries.¹ After the cult of Isis had spread across the sea, the goddess became the patron divinity of travellers, and at one of her festivals, held in March, she inaugurated navigation for the year.²

In Upper Egypt in particular Isis continued to be worshipped until the mid VIth century A.D., well after the spread of Christianity throughout the civilized world. At this time, in the reign of Justinian, the great temple of Isis at Philae was finally converted into a church.

II.2 There is obviously an element of truth in Diodorus' interpretation of the name Osiris as πολυόφθαλμος. The name is written

in Egyptian  *Wsir*, and the true meaning is generally thought to be "seat of the eye." However Plutarch³ also gives the etymology "many-eyed", and this is clearly based on a popular etymology which mistakenly derived the name from 'šj "many" and *irt* "eye", the pronunciation of which would have been something like *ōshire.

II.2 For the Greeks ὁ ποιητής could only be Homer. The line occurs on several occasions, e.g. *Iliad*, III, 277; *Odyssey*, XII, 323.

II.3 Plutarch⁴ also equates Osiris and Sirius; but it was usually Isis in Egyptian tradition who was associated or identified with Sirius, and she appears thus in Pyr. 632. Sirius was frequently associated with Orion and the morning-star as helpers of the dead, who were themselves represented as stars;⁵ and as Orion was identified with Osiris, so Sirius was identified with Isis. Hence Plutarch *DIO*, 21: τὰ μὲν σώματα παρ' αὐτοῖς κεῖσθαι καμόντα καὶ θεραπεύεσθαι τὰς δὲ ψυχὰς ἐν οὐρανῷ λάμπειν ἄστρα, καὶ καλεῖσθαι κύνα μὲν τὴν

¹ And these two deities, patron gods of the royal house of the Ptolemies, retained their power even after the Ptolemies had given place to the Roman emperors. Indeed, by the time of Septimius Severus, Sarapis had intruded into the Capitoline triad, and the emperor was frequently depicted as this god, and his wife as Isis. See L'Orange, *Apotheosis in Ancient Portraiture*, pp. 77-86.

² See below ch. 14.3.

³ *De Iside et Osiride*, 10.

⁴ *DIO*, 52.

⁵ Lacau, "Textes religieux", *Rec. Trav.*, XXXII, 1910, 78-87.

Ἰσιδος ὑφ' Ἑλλήνων, ὑπ' Αἰγυπτίων δὲ Σῶθιν . . . This gave rise in later times to representations of Isis on a dog's back.¹

II.3 The quotation from the Orphic writings (Kern frg. 237) is the earliest known mention of the name Phanes, the principle of life, firstborn of the gods, and sprung from the cosmic egg.²

II.4 Although Diodorus refers to a "fawn-skin" worn by Osiris, what he is describing is obviously the panther-skin worn by certain priests. The spots on the skin were generally represented as ⊗, hence Diodorus' comparison of them with stars in the sky.³ The panther-skin was usually confined to high-priests who presided at sacrifices, presented offerings, or anointed the king at his coronation, and the badge was assumed by the monarch when officiating on similar occasions.

II.4 Diodorus' etymology of the name Isis contains, as does that of Osiris, a grain of truth. Although Isis was certainly of ancient origin, this is not the meaning of her name; but it is far from being an implausible suggestion, since it is obvious that there was some confusion between the Greek form of the name and the Egyptian word *is* "old." This would have been facilitated by the fact that by the Ptolemaic period, and probably earlier, knowledge of hieroglyphs diminished rapidly, and the sound of a word was of greater significance than its writing.

It is, however, possible that the etymologies involved in this chapter were not Greek, but Egyptian in origin. Iversen, *Fragments of a Hieroglyphic Dictionary* (*Papyrus Carlsberg* VII), p. II-13, points out that the Egyptians themselves would explain a word by means of alliterative etymologies, each of which represented a new aspect of the origin of the word. It is possible then that "many-eyed" and "ancient" were Egyptian etymologies for Osiris and Isis and that these were thought to give an independent explanation of the mythical origin of the deities.

II.4 In assigning a reason for the horns on Isis' head, Diodorus

¹ Merkelbach, *Isisfeste in griechisch-römischer Zeit*, p. 27f. Bonnet, *Reallexikon s.v.* Sothis.

² Guthrie, *Orpheus*, p. 8off., 96. Cf. Cumont in *RHR* CIX, 1934, 63 ff.

³ Borchardt, *Allerhand Kleinigkeiten*, p. 21f., and pl. 9(i).

is confusing cause and effect. Isis in her role of mother of Horus was identified with Hathor—a goddess often depicted as a cow, ruler of the skies, and nurse of the king of Egypt, the living Horus—and was as a result depicted wearing the same headdress of lyriiform horns enfolding the solar disk. This identification of Isis with Hathor was strengthened, and may even have been caused, by the fact that both were worshipped as mothers of Horus in his different aspects.¹ It would appear that Isis had no connection with the moon until a late date,² by which time Osiris had become identified with the sun, and Isis as his wife would then naturally be associated with the moon. The headdress of horns  may have been mistaken for the symbol of the moon .

11.5f. The belief in the sun's importance as the source of life in the universe belongs to late-Hellenistic thought.³ It is found widely in authors of this era, both Greek and Roman, and it is generally believed that the original author and advocate of the theory is most likely to be Posidonius.⁴ To Posidonius also is attributed the concept of the cosmic importance of the moon. The major problem in Diodorus' account of the joint responsibility of the sun and the moon for cosmic harmony is that, according to him, the moon was responsible for both the moist and dry elements. That the moon was connected with moisture was a common concept,⁵ but there is no known source for the belief that it was connected with the dry element.⁶ To add to the confusion, τὸ ξηρόν appears to correspond

¹ The name Hathor means "House of Horus." For Hathor as the mother of Horus see Griffiths, *The Conflict of Horus and Seth*, p. 13.

² This appears to have been a Greek rather than an Egyptian idea: Egyptian moon-gods are generally male (*cf.* e.g. Thoth, Khons). The Greeks however often identified Isis with Selene (Plutarch, *DIO*, 43; Bonnet, *Reallexikon*, p. 328, 472).

³ Though Gilbert, *Meteorologische Theorien*, 180f., 696f, finds a trace of it in Aristotle.

⁴ Spoerri, *Späthellenistische Berichte*, p. 170-174.

⁵ For Classical refs., see Spoerri, *op. cit.*, p. 173f.; for Isis as the moist element, *cf.* Plutarch, *DIO*, 12. Isis appears as rain-maker in the Rhind Mathematical Papyrus, ed. A. C. Chase, I, 119; II, pl. 108; ed. Peet, pl. 7, no. 87, and p. 129. See also Schäfer, "Isis Regengöttin", *ZÄS*, LXVI, 1931, 139; Müller, *Isis-Aretalogien*, p. 67ff.

⁶ Though as Spoerri points out (*op. cit.*, p. 174, n. 33) the words of Plutarch, *Fac. Orb.*, 25, 939 F may suggest that he knew of some such doctrine.

in the following chapter to the element earth, personified as Demeter.

11.5 Homer and Hesiod distinguish three seasons: *ἔαρος ὥρη*, *θήρεος ὥρη* and *χείματος* or *χειμῶνος ὥρη*. A fourth season representing autumn first appears in Alcman 76, but was not universally accepted. At a later date as many as seven seasons were distinguished.

CHAPTER 12

12.1f. The thought in this chapter is almost solely Greek, although the deities mentioned purport to be a translation of the Egyptian originals. Diodorus' analysis of the universe into five elements differs from the traditional Stoic theory that only four elements were involved: fire, air, earth and water. His fifth element, *πνεῦμα* corresponds to the fifth element of the Peripatetic philosophy,¹ aether. However, the Stoics did attribute cosmological significance to *πνεῦμα*, and Diodorus' account of the supposedly Egyptian teaching on the subject appears to be based on a combination of Aristotelian and Stoic doctrine. Nevertheless in many instances parallels can be found in Egyptian mythology.

12.2 Zeus was identified by the Greeks with Amūn, who was frequently called "king of the gods."² Originally a member of the Hermopolitan Ogdoad, Amūn was almost unknown in the Old Kingdom; he first appears in Thebes in the Middle Kingdom, and did not become famous until Thebes rose to prominence in the New Kingdom. He is usually represented in human form, but also appears with a ram's head. From the New Kingdom onwards, Amūn was associated with the air and the breath of life. He was also at a later date thought to be god of the winds.³

12.3 Hephaestus was identified with Ptah. See below ch. 13.3.

¹ And ultimately of Aristotle. See Spoerri, *op. cit.*, p. 186ff.

² The quotation is from Homer, and occurs frequently.

³ Cf. Plutarch, *DIO*, 36; Sethe, *Amun und die acht Urgötter von Hermopolis*, §§ 187-216; *Urgeschichte*, § 164; Bonnet, *Reallexikon*, 35.

12.4 Demeter was one of the Greek goddesses to be identified with Isis. See above ch. 11.1. For the quotation see Kern, *Orph.*, frg. 302.

12.5 The feminine form Oceane appears to be found only here and in ch. 19, where it is given as the earliest name for the Nile. It is presumably meant to be an Egyptian name, since Diodorus then adds that the Greek form was the masculine Oceanus, but this seems most improbable. In fact, it seems to be a garbled reference to Isis: Plutarch, *DIO*, 56, reads ἡ δ' Ἰσις ἔστιν ὅτε καὶ Μοῦθ, καὶ πάλιν Ἀθυρί καὶ Μεθυέρ προσαγορεύεται. Isis was often called *mwṯ* "mother" or *mwṯ-nṯr* "mother of the god" i.e. Horus.¹ Methyer is the Greek form of *mḥt wrt* "the great flood", a reference to the primeval ocean.² This epithet seems to have been applied to Hathor, the cow-goddess, who is thus shown to represent the primeval waters from which creation emerged, in female form. It is through her association with this goddess that Isis may have had this name.

12.6 Oceanus is the equivalent of Nun, the Egyptian god of the primeval waters, from whose chaos the first creation emerged in the form of the primeval hill. Nun is referred to as "father of the gods",³ and was identified with Osiris because of his aspect of fertility.⁴ For this reason it seems the more likely that the feminine form Oceane should indeed be a reference to Isis.

Diodorus' quotation is from *Iliad*, XIV, 201, 302. For the importance of Oceanus in late-Hellenistic thought as the moist nourishing principle in the cosmos, see Spoerri, *Späthellenistische Berichte*, p. 184-6.

12.6 By the time Diodorus visited Egypt, many of the original Egyptian cities bore a new Greek name, usually based on the identification of the local god with a specific Greek deity. Thus Zeus was identified with Amūn of Thebes, and the Greek name for Thebes, Διοσπόλις, is an exact translation of the Egyptian *nṯwt n* 'Imn "city of Amūn."⁵

¹ *Wb*, II, 54.

² *Wb*, II, 122; Kees, *Götterglaube*, 75f.; Bonnet, *Reallexikon*, s.v. Methyer.

³ Kees, *op. cit.*, 215.

⁴ Junker, *Abaton*, 38.

⁵ See below ch. 15.1, and Gardiner, *Ancient Egyptian Onomastica*, II,

Helios was identified with the Egyptian god Rē' (or Atum, since the two were fused at Heliopolis), originally the most important solar deity. The main seat of his worship was 'Iwnw or On, known to the Greeks from Herodotus onwards as Heliopolis.¹

Hermes was equated with the Egyptian Thoth, worshipped particularly at Hmnw (modern El-Ashmûnein), and named "Lord of Khmun" as early as the Vth Dyn. This city became known to the Greeks as Hermopolis Magna.²

The city ascribed here to Apollo is probably Edfu (Egyptian *Dbb* or *Bhd(t)*), whose chief deity was Horus the Elder³ with whom Apollo is to be identified, rather than the later Apollinopolis (Kôm Isfaht). The latter may date only from Roman times, and is in any case rather to the West of the Nile.⁴

For the city ascribed to Pan, Panopolis, see below ch. 18.2.

Eileithuia was identified with the Egyptian goddess Nekhbet. A vulture goddess, she was particularly associated with the town Per-Nekhbet (literally "place of Nekhbet") or El-Kâb in the IIIrd Upper Egyptian nome, and already in predynastic times she had become the tutelary goddess of Upper Egypt.⁵ In one of her aspects she was considered to be the goddess of childbirth, and as such was associated with the Greek Eileithuia.⁶

12.7 Athene was identified with Neith, protectress of Sais.⁷ The goddess played a double role as a warrior and as a woman skilled in the arts, as did Athene, hence presumably the identification. An ancient divinity, she was worshipped as a fetish of two crossed arrows on an animal skin, rather than as an animal itself. Neith became prominent only after the middle of the VIIth century B.C.

p. 24*f. For other less important towns of this name see Gardiner, *op. cit.*, I, p. 33*, 181*.

¹ Gardiner, II, p. 144*ff.

² Gardiner, II, p. 79*f.; for Hermopolis Parva see Gardiner, II, p. 197*. For the equation of Thoth and Hermes see below ch. 16.

³ See below ch. 13.4.

⁴ Gardiner, *op. cit.*, II, p. 56*ff.

⁵ Corresponding to Edjo of Buto, tutelary goddess of the Delta region.

⁶ See Černý, *Ancient Egyptian Religion*, p. 22f.; Bonnet, *Reallexikon*; Gardiner, *op. cit.*, II, p. 8*.

⁷ Cf. Plato, *Timaeus*, III, 21 E. She was not, however, indigenous to Sais (see Baumgartel, *Cultures*, I, p. 46f.).

when Sais became the dynastic capital, and she became a sky-goddess. She was also clearly identified with Isis at some point, and assumed human form.¹

With Diodorus' explanation of Athene may be compared that of Diogenes of Babylon,² who also ascribes to the birth of this goddess cosmological significance, equating her with the ether. It is for this reason that Spoerri believes that Diogenes cannot be Diodorus' source, since the latter equates Athene not with ether, but with air.³ But the argument is not necessarily convincing, since Diodorus rarely seems to employ technical terminology, and may be using the word air to include the ether. His equation of Athena with air presumably accounts for his explanation of the epithet Tritogeneia; it is the air which changes its nature with the seasons.⁴

CHAPTER 13

13.1f. Jacoby⁵ believes this passage, which, according to him, belongs to Hecataeus' *Aigyptiaca*, to be the pattern for the well-known theory of Euhemerus. But if, as Spoerri maintains,⁶ Diodorus' material belongs to his own century, this theory becomes untenable: what Diodorus reveals must be not the origin but the after-effects of Euhemerism.

But is there in fact any trace of Euhemerism in the passage? The basis of this idea is the superficial similarity between this chapter and a passage from Diodorus VI in Eusebius *Praep. Ev.*, II, 2.59C-61A, where the gods are said to have been divided by men of old into two classes, the immortals (αἰδίοι, ἄφθαρτοι) and the ἐπίγειοι. The passage is introduced by the words: ταῦτα ὁ Διόδωρος ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ τῶν Ἱστοριῶν· ὁ δ' αὐτὸς καὶ ἐν τῇ ἑκτῇ ἀπὸ τῆς Εὐημέρου τοῦ Μεσσηνίου γραφῆς ἐπικυροῖ τὴν αὐτὴν θεολογίαν, κατὰ λέξιν ὥδε φάσκων.

¹ Plutarch, *DIO*, 9.

² Spoerri, *op. cit.*, p. 182-4.

³ αἰθήρ is technically the upper, ἀήρ the lower, air.

⁴ See Cook, *Zeus*, III, p. 726f.; Farnell, *Cults of the Greek City States*, I, 265-270. See also below ch. 26.5.

⁵ *RE*, VI, 1, s.v. Euhemerus; *FGvH*, 264, F 1 Comm., p. 38. See Spoerri, *Späthellenistische Berichte*, p. 189, n. 1.

⁶ Spoerri, *op. cit.*, p. 189-195.

But in the first place there is no mention here of Zeus, who appears to have had some significance in Euhemerus' system; and in the second place, although this passage is the sole instance where the οὐρανίοι θεοί are mentioned in connection with Euhemerus,¹ it cannot be said with certainty that the cosmic deities such as the sun and moon had any part in Euhemerus' system. Certainly there is some similarity with Book I, in that both οὐρανίοι and ἐπίγειοι θεοί are mentioned (I, 12.10; 13.1); but if the fragment from Book VI has, as Spoerri suspects, little connection with Euhemerus, the same is true of Book I.

13.1f. The earliest recorded Egyptian versions of their own remote past date from Ramessid times. From this period dates the Turin Canon, which agrees substantially with Manetho's account. The oldest kings are definitely associated with Heliopolis, and therefore the list ought to begin with the sun-god, Rē'-Atum, or in Greek Helios. But in fact Manetho² names Hephaestus as the first ruler of Egypt, suggesting that this version was originally compiled in the VIth Dyn., the kings of which came from Memphis, the centre of worship of Ptah.³

Although Diodorus records what is primarily the Heliopolitan tradition, starting with Helios, it is clear that he is also aware of the Memphite theology since he records a variant genealogy of Hephaestus, (?Helios), Cronus, and Osiris. It is possible that this owes something to Manetho, who may be included in the ἔνιοι δὲ τῶν ἱερέων, a phrase which presumably refers otherwise to the priests of Memphis.

13.3 The Greek god Hephaestus was identified with the Egyptian god Ptah, an identification aided by the fact that Ptah was noted as a craftsman, while Hephaestus was the god of smithying.⁴

¹ *Loc. cit.*, 60c.

² Ap. Eusebius, *Chronica*, I, p. 93; Syncellus, p. 32.

³ Gardiner, *Egypt of the Pharaohs*, p. 421.

⁴ Sandman Holmberg, *The God Ptah*, p. 49. There is in fact late evidence of a temple of Ptah at Alexandria, subordinate to that of Memphis, whose priests were named Hephaestus priests. The god in question, however, was not the Greek Hephaestus, but the Egyptian Ptah. (*Ibid.*, p. 250; Otto, *Priester und Tempel*, I, p. 22).

The story of the discovery of fire given here does not follow the usual Greek tradition, according to which it was Prometheus who stole fire from Zeus (ap. Hesiod, Aeschylus, etc.), or from Hephaestus and Athene (ap. Plato), and gave it to mankind. It is certainly not Egyptian in origin, and the setting is entirely Greek. J. G. Frazer,¹ speaking of the Indian myths concerning the origin of fire, remarks that the fire-bringer Matarisvan is probably a personification of the lightning-flash, and compares him with Hephaestus, who fell from heaven. He continues, "Perhaps the Greek legend of the fall of Hephaestus from heaven may have been a mythological expression of the same natural and often repeated phenomenon. If that were so, we might expect to find Hephaestus figuring in Greek mythology as the first bringer of fire to men, but no such myth, so far as I know, has come down to us." Farnell² disagrees with this, maintaining that although the lightning-struck tree is cited as the source of the celebrated "Lemnian fire",³ this does not mean that Hephaestus was a god of lightning. The Roman god Vulcanus was associated with lightning, but he is not to be identified with Hephaestus.

Hephaestus was closely associated with Lemnos, being believed to have landed there after falling from heaven, but his exact connection with fire or lightning cannot have been clearly defined. It may be that the tradition involving Prometheus was discarded here in favour of one naming Hephaestus, simply because the latter was identified with the Egyptian Ptah.

13.4 For the construction of the Egyptian calendar, see below ch. 50.2.

The myth that the epagomenal days were the birthdays of the "children of Nut" was apparently a Heliopolitan invention to bring the schematic year to 365 days. The deities born on these five days were Osiris, Haroëris, Seth, Isis and Nephthys in that order.⁴

¹ *Myths of the Origin of Fire*, (1930), p. 200.

² *Cults of the Greek City States*, V, p. 376, n. (d).

³ Tzetzes *Lykophron* 227 (= *FGrH*, 4, F 71b). See also above, introduction p. 9.

⁴ Kees, *Der Götterglaube in alten Ägypten*, p. 259f.; see also Mercer, *The Pyramid Texts*, I, Pyr. ch. 1961; Griffiths, *Origins of Osiris*, p. 68-71.

Typhon was identified with Seth at least by the time of Herodotus,¹ but the identification may belong to the previous century: Pherecydes of Syros compares the myth of Typhon's (i.e. Seth's) struggle against Horus and Osiris with Greek theomachies.²

Apollo is presumably then to be identified with Haroëris³ and Aphrodite with Nephthys.⁴

CHAPTER 14

14.1 References to cannibalism as a normal practice in primitive society are rare in the Classical authors.⁵ In the Egyptian sources cannibalism is mentioned only twice. Vandier, *Mo'alla*, p. 221, inscr. 10. "The whole of Upper Egypt perished from hunger, every man eating his children"; and James, *The Hekanakhte Papers*, pp. 32, 35, "See, they are beginning to eat men here." However, Vandier, *La famine dans l'Égypte ancienne*, pp. 8f., 12-15, concludes that these are no more than figurative exaggerations, and cannot be taken literally.

The main evidence for believing that cannibalism was practised at an early stage in Egyptian history is the "Cannibal Hymn" found in the Pyramids of Wenis and Tety.⁶ The picture given of life after death is one of the dead king as an unremitting hunter, slaying the gods like cattle to be cooked and eaten. The purpose of this is clearly that the king may possess himself of the power and qualities of his victims, a primitive belief. There is in any case no reason to doubt that the custom of eating one's opponent in war, or at least of tasting his blood, existed in Egypt at an early date; it was fairly widespread among primitive peoples. How long the custom lasted,

¹ II, 144.

² Kraus, "Vorsokratische I", *Hermes*, LXIX, 1934, 114-119.

³ *Hr wr* "the elder Horus" as opposed to the son of Isis with whom he was subsequently confused even in Egyptian texts. See also below ch. 17.4 (*cf.* Plutarch, *DIO*, 12).

⁴ Aphrodite was usually identified with Hathor, see below ch. 97.8, but it is possible that Nephthys too was identified with Hathor.

⁵ See Moschion, frg. 6.14f. (ap. Nauck, p. 813): *βορὰι δὲ σαρκοβρῶτες ἀλλήλοκτόνους / παρεῖχον αὐτοῖς δαῖτας*; and *cf.* Kern, *Orph.* frg., 292; Cicero, *De Inv.*, I, 2.

⁶ Faulkner, "The Cannibal Hymn from the Pyramid Texts", *JEA*, X, 1924, 97-103.

it is difficult to say, but the "Cannibal Hymn" cannot be used as proof of its continued existence. It may well have died out long before the date of the "Cannibal Hymn" which then records a distant memory with symbolic significance for subsequent ages.¹

There is a similar symbolic example of cannibalism to be found in an inscription at Edfu:² "Utterance by Shining Bull: 'I cut out the hearts of those who fight against the Behdet, I tear out the hearts of thy foes, I swallow the gore of those who are hostile to thy city, I taste the kidneys of thine enemies'."

Diodorus makes a further reference to cannibalism below, ch. 84.1, when he says that it occurred under the stress of famine. There is no reason to doubt his story, since throughout history there are reports of men being driven to this extremity in times of need.

14.1 The discovery of wheat and barley is presumably attributed to Isis in her association with Osiris as a vegetation god, and thence as the equivalent of the Greek earth mother, Demeter, to whom wheat and barley were sacred.³ According to Greek legend it was Demeter who allowed the spread of the discovery of the use of grain, through the agency of Triptolemus, whom she sent as a missionary to all mankind. In gratitude for this knowledge, many Greek cities sent the first-fruits of their harvest as an offering to Demeter and Persephone at Eleusis.

14.2 In Egypt the harvest was the last festival of the natural year and signified the annual death of the god in the grain (Osiris). The official early Egyptian harvest ritual involved the cutting of a sheaf of grain by the king, and its dedication not to Osiris or Isis, but to Min, the god of fertility symbolized by a white bull.⁴

¹ The tradition that Osiris was responsible for putting an end to cannibalism (recorded in the hymn of Cyme 1.21 and the hymn of Ios 1.18—see below ch. 27) may suggest that any practice of cannibalism belongs only to the remotest period of Egyptian history.

² Blackman and Fairman, "The Myth of Horus at Edfu II", *JEA*, XXIX, 1943, 2-36. The relevant passage is on p. 11 in "The Triumph of Horus over his Enemies."

³ See the hymns to Isis, below ch. 27.4.

⁴ Frankfort, *Kingship and the Gods*, p. 187ff. The feast of Min was more than a simple harvest festival, and involved the mystery of conception and rebirth. (Bleeker, *Die Geburt eines Gottes. Eine Studie über den ägyptischen Gott Min und sein Fest*, Leiden 1956).

In the final act of the ritual the king returned from the shrine of Min holding in his hand some ears of the cut and consecrated grain.

Two great festivals of Isis are known from Roman times: in March Isis inaugurated navigation for the year; and in November there was a three day feast at which there were performances representing the death of Osiris, and the search for and recovery of his body.¹ It is obviously to this latter festival rather than to the Egyptian harvest ritual that Diodorus must be referring, particularly as his references to the people beating themselves suggest lamentation rather than an expression of thanksgiving.²

14.4 θεσμοφόρον—*cf.* the Isis hymn from Andros 1.20, where Isis is called θεσμοθέτις; and the Ios hymn 1.52: Ἐγὼ εἶμι ἡ θεσμοφόρος καλουμένη.³

CHAPTER 15

15.1 Diospolis or Thebes is the Egyptian *nīwt 'Imn* or *nīwt nt 'Imn* (Old Testament Nō: *Jer.*, XLVI, 25), "city of Amūn", of which, since Zeus was identified with Amūn, Diospolis is a literal translation. The origin of the name Thebes is less easily determined. Gardiner, *Ancient Egyptian Onomastica*, II, p. 24f. suggests that the Greek name Θῆβαι, found as early as Homer,⁴ must have been the product of a comparison of the name of the Boeotian town with some similar sounding name for the Egyptian town. *T3 ipt, *tape*, "the Harem" or "the Sanctuary"⁵ seems the least unlikely suggestion, although the name is never found in this form with the prefixed feminine article. In fact the city of Thebes was commonly known in Egypt simply as "the City", *Nīwt* or Nō.

15.1 ἦν ἐκεῖνους μὲν ἐπώνυμον ποιῆσαι τῆς μητρὸς—As H. Schäfer, "Ägyptische Worte bei Diodor", *ZÄS*, XLI, 1904, 140-142, points

¹ Merkelbach, *Isisfeste in griechisch-römischer Zeit*, p. 42ff.; Tran Tam Tinh, *Le Culte d'Isis a Pompéi*, p. 98ff.; Eрман, *Die Religion der Ägypter*, p. 432; Cumont, *Oriental Religions*, p. 97f.

² *Cf.* Firmicus Maternus, *De errore prof. relig.*, 2, 6f.

³ See below ch. 27.4. See also Müller, *Isis-Aretalogien*, p. 26f.

⁴ *Il.*, IX, 381.

⁵ See below ch. 97.9.

out, the mother of Osiris in this chapter is Hera, who is usually equated with the Egyptian goddess Mut. This sheds no light on Diodorus' statement that Thebes was originally named after her. But in ch. 13 Diodorus gives an alternative genealogy, according to which Osiris was the son of Cronus and Rhea, apparently identified with Geb and Nut. Since Thebes was generally called simply "the City", *nīwt*, in Schäfer's view Diodorus' statement is the result of a confusion in Hellenistic times between the name of the goddess Nut, and that of the city, *nīwt*.

15.3 The temple dedicated to Zeus and Hera by Osiris, to which Diodorus refers here, is obviously the great temple of Amūn at Karnak. Far from being the work of any one king, the temple was alternately demolished and rebuilt by a succession of kings, each determined to leave his mark on the structure. This is particularly true of the XVIIIth Dyn., but there still stands today a chapel restored by Philip Arrhidaeus, as late as 323-317 B.C.¹

15.5 Gold was quite widely distributed in Egypt, generally in an impure state.² The gold-bearing region lay mainly between the Nile valley and the Red Sea, chiefly in the area of the Eastern desert stretching south from the Qena-Quseir road to the Sudan frontiers. Vercoutter, "The Gold of Kush", *Kush*, VII, 1959, 120-153, discusses the three main gold-bearing regions, and notes that the northernmost one, supplying "gold of Coptos", was situated around the Wadi Hammamāt and the Wadi Abbad. Diodorus may have considered this area loosely as being in the vicinity of Thebes.

Copper ores occur in Egypt mainly in Sinai and the Eastern desert,³ but it is difficult to tell whether the ancient workings in Sinai were actually for copper, or for turquoise alone. Because there is no mention of copper in the early tribute lists, it is probable that mining in the Eastern desert was in the hands of the Egyptians and not of the Nubians.

15.6 This etymology of Dionysus would derive it from Dio- (or Dios, the genitive form of the nominative Zeus) and Nysus (Nysa).

¹ Kees, *Ancient Egypt*, p. 258ff.

² Lucas, *Ancient Egyptian Materials and Industries* 4, p. 224ff.

³ Lucas, *op. cit.*, p. 201ff.

But there is no agreement among the ancient or modern scholars on the correct etymology. Nor has it been determined finally whether the name Dionysus is of Thracian origin, or is the Greek name for the God. Kretschmer, *Aus der Anomia*, p. 22f. sees it as Thracian, meaning "son of god", while Rohde, *Psyche*, IX, n. 1 maintains that it is Greek.¹

While it is commonly agreed in the Classical authors that the birth-place of Dionysus was Nysa, there is some dispute about its exact locality: according to Herodotus II, 146; III, 97, it was in Ethiopia; Diodorus III, 66 places it in Libya; while Pliny, *N.H.*, V, 74 refers to Nysa in Scythia. The Arabian Nysa of the present chapter may well be south of Damascus² somewhere; and to add to the problem, in ch. 19.7 Diodorus refers to Nysa as a city in Egypt.

15.7 The quotation is from *Homeric Hymns*, I, 8-9.

15.8 From the evidence it appears that Dionysus was not, in origin, only or even mainly a god of wine. The first association of Dionysus with the vine occurs not in Homer, but in Hesiod, *Works and Days*, 614, and his connection with other plants such as ivy may possibly be earlier than that with the vine.³ Guthrie, *The Greeks and their Gods*, p. 164, suggests that he was a god of every life-giving moisture, including wine. Certainly by Roman times he was first and foremost the wine-god.

CHAPTER 16

16.1 The Greeks commonly identified Hermes with the Egyptian god Thoth.⁴ Thoth in origin was a lunar deity in the form of an ibis. He appears to have had charge of every aspect of the intellect, and is credited with the invention of writing, the development of language, mathematical calculations and the divisions of the calendar. The late papyrus, Carlsberg VII,⁵ 1.4, reads, "Thoth the

¹ See Kern, *RE*, V, 1010f.

² Stein, *RE*, XVII, 2, 1640.

³ Dodds, *Euripides' Bacchae*, p. xiff.

⁴ Boylan, *Thoth the Hermes of Egypt*.

⁵ Iversen, *Fragments of a Hieroglyphic Dictionary*.

chief of the marvels in the house of clothing, who regulates the entire land . . ."

Many of the god's attributes undoubtedly developed from the fact that he was the moon-god. As such Thoth was regarded as the ordering principle of civil and religious life; for it was by reference to the phases of the moon that daily life was largely ordered. At an early stage he is referred to as the originator of divine sacrificial worship and the author of all order in the state. It is probably because Thoth was the moon-god, and therefore the complement of the sun-god, that he came to be considered as the scribe of Rē'. In the New Kingdom "Book of the Dead" Thoth holds this position, and accompanies Rē' in the solar barque on his administrative journeys. However, with the development of the Osirian cycle and the identification of Osiris with Rē', he became the scribe of Osiris. Thoth is also the lord of magical utterance. In a hymn addressed to him,¹ he is said to be "he who has given words and script, who makes the gods to know what is needful (i.e. sacrifice and ritual)." He appears regularly as the inventor of script, language and literature,² and a common epithet of his is "lord of writing." According to Plato³ it was Θϑϑ who distinguished different letters, vowels, consonants and stops.

There is no evidence that Thoth had any connection with music in Egypt. He was, however, concerned with calculations. But although the Greeks were fully aware of the close connection between mathematics and music, it is probable that the association of Thoth with the latter arose directly from his identification with Hermes. The lyre was in any case unknown in Egypt until it was imported from Asia during the New Kingdom. And the Greek lyre, traditionally the invention of Hermes and given by him to Apollo, had seven strings, not three.⁴

There is no evidence that the Egyptians believed in exercising the

¹ Turayeff, *ZAS*, XXXIII, 1895, 123.

² P. Hearst, VI, 9f.; P. Ebers, I, 8-10.

³ *Philebus VII*: cf. also *Phaedrus*, LIX.

⁴ There is however an example of an Egyptian instrument with three strings. See Leibovitch, "The Statuette of an Egyptian Harper, and String Instruments in Egyptian Statuary", *JEA*, XLVI, 1960, 53-59. For the number of seasons, see above ch. 11.5.

body as well as the mind, as did the Greeks; and presumably there was no equivalent of the Greek palaestra. However, at Beni Hasan there are representations of wrestling matches, so the sport was clearly not unknown.¹

Diodorus' account of Hermes is obviously a conflation of Greek and Egyptian elements; while his association with wrestling and music must come from the Greek tradition, the rest of his attributes as Diodorus describes them may equally well come from the Egyptian Thoth.

16.2 The olive was never widely cultivated in Egypt.² References to it in Egyptian texts are rare and must be treated with caution, as the terms used often refer to the moringa tree and ben oil. The word for "olive" does not occur before the XIXth Dyn., although there is an XVIIIth Dyn. representation of an olive tree.

Theophrastus *Enquiry into Plants*, IV, 2.7 says that the olive grew in the Thebaid, as does Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, XIII, 19. Strabo, XVII, 1.35, records that it grew in the Fayûm and near Alexandria. But in general, conditions in Egypt were unsuitable for its cultivation, and it never flourished, although the Greeks tried to grow it in the most suitable areas (which were in fact the Fayûm and Alexandria).

CHAPTER 17

17.1f. With the suggestion that Osiris civilized mankind as a means of obtaining for himself immortal glory, compare Diodorus' general introduction, especially ch. 2.4.

17.3 Whom exactly Diodorus has in mind when he talks of Herakles at this juncture it is difficult to say. Herakles is variously identified with Herishef (in Greek (H)Arsaphes) "He who is on his lake", a ram-headed god and probably a Nile god; with Khons, apparently a moon-god in origin, and little known outside Thebes; and with Shu, an ancient deity of the air, separator of earth and

¹ Newberry, *Beni Hasan*, II, pl. LV and VI; see also Wilsdorf, *Ringkampff im alten Ägypten*.

² Lucas, *Ancient Egyptian Materials and Industries*⁴, p. 333f.

sky. His identification with Shu, and probably also with Khons in the form Khons-Shu at Thebes, may well have resulted from the fact that all were noted for their strength. Shu in particular is frequently portrayed in Egyptian art holding apart heaven and earth. With this must be compared the story of Herakles' quest for the Golden Apples of the Hesperides, in the course of which Herakles was duped by Atlas into taking the heavens upon his shoulders.¹ Moreover Shu and his consort became fused in Egyptian mythology with the lion gods of Leontopolis.² Again, one may compare with this the fact that from the VIth century B.C. Herakles was invariably depicted with a lion-skin.³

17.3 Antaeus is also mentioned in ch. 21.4, but it is not clear whether Diodorus distinguishes two persons of the same name, or whether there was only one Antaeus. The Greeks believed Antaeus to be a giant of North Africa, and his mythological defeat in battle by Herakles was seen as the triumph of Greek discipline over rude barbarian force. Although he had no true Egyptian counterpart, by Hellenistic times Antaeus was definitely identified with an Upper Egyptian god.⁴

There appears to be some evidence that at some stage Busiris and Antaeus were considered to be brothers. Thus Ovid, *Ibis*, 397-400:

*Ut qui post annum sacri monstrator iniqui
Elicuit pluvias victima caesus aquas ;
Frater et Antaei, quo sanguine debuit aras
Tinxit et exemplis occidit ipse suis ;*

Of line 399, La Penna writes in his edition of the text, "Busiride fratello di Anteo, in quante anche lui figlio di Nettuno. Fu ucciso da Ercole e bagno così del suo sangue quegli altari su cui aveva immolata tanti innocenti." The Scholia, however believe Busiris to be the subject of ll.397-8, and without exception explain the "frater . . . Antaei" of l.399 as Pygmalion or Thrax/Thrasios. There

¹ Schol. Apoll. Rhod., IV, 1396/99b.

² Bonnet, *Reallexikon*, s.v. Schu.

³ *OCD*², p. 499.

⁴ See below ch. 21.4.

is clearly some confusion concerning the subjects of these two couplets, but this is hardly surprising: it was Thrasios, brother of Pygmalion,¹ who suggested human sacrifice to Busiris as a means of alleviating the nine-year famine in Egypt, and who was immediately sacrificed by Busiris as the first victim; while Busiris was slain by Herakles on his own sacrificial altar in the process of attempting to immolate Herakles. Thus it would be possible to maintain that either of these, Thrasios or Busiris, could be the subject of either couplet. But since Thrasios is always described as brother of Pygmalion, it appears more likely that the brother of Antaeus was Busiris. Certainly these two are connected elsewhere² in mythology.

The tradition that Busiris was an ἐπιμελητής of Osiris may be the result of Euhemerism, following the Hellenistic fashion.³ And in the earliest versions of the story Busiris appears to have no connection with Herakles. Hesiod, frg. 222, mentions him simply as the son of Aigyptos.⁴ But by the time of Pherecydes, frg. 33, Busiris is the son of Poseidon⁵ who sacrificed strangers upon the altar of Zeus, until he was himself killed by Herakles.⁶

17.3 Apollo was normally identified with Horus,⁷ the son, not the brother of Osiris. But it does not appear to be Horus son of Isis and Osiris to whom Diodorus is referring, and Apollo here must rather be equated with Plutarch's Apollo⁸ who is Haroëris, or the elder Horus. On the other hand, of course, the inclusion of Apollo may be a purely Greek element in the Osiris/Dionysus story, intended to demonstrate the close connection between the Apolline and Dionysiac cults.⁹

¹ Wust, in *RE*, XXIII, 2, p. 2075.

² Ovid, *Met.*, IX, 182-3.

³ Cf. also Steph. Byz. s.v. Βούσιρις . . . οἱ δ' ὅτι τοπάρχης ἦν ὁ Βούσιρις ὑπὸ Ὀσίριδος κατασταθείς.

⁴ Cf. Apollod., II, 1.5.3.

⁵ For which reason perhaps he is credited with the governorship of those parts of Egypt bordering on the sea.

⁶ See also below ch. 67.11.

⁷ See below ch. 25.7.

⁸ *DIO*, 12, and see above p. 73 n. 3.

⁹ See below ch. 23.1. Guthrie, *The Greeks and their Gods*, p. 201f.; Rohde, *Psyche*, p. 287f.

17.4 Although Diodorus associates the laurel with Egypt, what he probably had in mind was the Greek δάφνη or bay, *Laurus nobilis*, mentioned by Theophrastus, *Plants*, V, 9.7; but this does not appear to have grown in Egypt. There is however the Daphne Alexandria, *Ruscus alexandrinus*, a plant which in ancient times enjoyed a pharmacological reputation, yielding the drug known as *Laurus alexandrinus*.¹

17.5 The possible identity of the plant which Diodorus calls ivy is discussed by Scott Moncrieff. "De Iside et Osiride", *JHS*, XXIX, 1909, 88n. Plutarch says that the Egyptian name was χενόσιρις, σημαίνοντος τοῦ ὀνόματος ὡς φασὶ φυτὸν Ὀσίριδος. But ivy has not been identified among the plants of ancient Egypt. *ỉḳt n wsir* might be a possible origin, but *ỉḳt* is a leek or green vegetable. Parthey suggests the Coptic *ⲙⲏⲏ* (Egyptian *šn*) "tree", while a further possibility might be *šndt n wsir*, "Acacia of Osiris." This might be confirmed by a passage in Athenaeus, XV, 679f., the ἄκανθα of which is identified in Liddell and Scott as a type of acacia, *Mimosa nilotica*. Strabo, XVII, 1.35 also mentions the city of Acanthus, containing a temple of Osiris, and a grove of Thebaic acantha.² The main drawback to this theory is that acacia is not evergreen. Griffiths, *Plutarch, DIO*, p. 440f. would derive χενόσιρις from an original **ḥt-n-wsir*,³ but while this provides an acceptable etymology, it sheds little light on the actual identity of the plant. The most acceptable answer seems to be that while ivy was unknown in ancient Egypt, it was nevertheless introduced during the Ptolemaic period. Thus, though it could not have been associated with Osiris before this time, there is no reason why it should not subsequently have become known as the φυτὸν Ὀσίριδος.⁴

¹ Theophr., *op. cit.*, I, 10.8; III, 17.4; Dioscorides, *De Materia Medica*, IV, 145; Tackholm and Drar, *Flora of Egypt*, III, p. 312.

² See also below ch. 97.2.

³ Eg. ḥ represented by Greek χ, see *Wb.*, III, 220, 307; ḥt by Coptic *ⲙⲏ*, *Wb.*, III, 339.

⁴ If ivy was not used in the cult of Osiris until Roman times, it might suggest that the sentence τοῦ δὲ κυττοῦ τὴν εὑρεσιν ... is an interpolated deduction on Diodorus' part, particularly as unlike the preceding and following sentences, it is not in *oratio obliqua*. However, the Ptolemies seem to have adopted the Dionysiac use of ivy (Tondriaux, "Tatouage, lierre et syncré-

CHAPTER 18

18.1 According to the Pyramid Texts, Anubis was the fourth son of Rē'. He became drawn into the Osirian cycle as the son of Osiris and Nephthys.¹ When the latter abandoned him, he was adopted by Isis and became her guardian. He subsequently became the companion of Osiris on his conquest of the world, and when Osiris was murdered, it was Anubis who embalmed his body. As the son of Osiris, Anubis was occasionally identified with Horus, particularly in the XVIIIth Upper Egyptian nome.² For his portrayal as a jackal, see below ch. 87.2.

18.1 Macedon must be identified with Wepwawet, the so-called "wolf" god,³ who was associated with Anubis as the companion and guardian of Osiris. In one instance Wepwawet also appears as the son of Osiris: "I am Wepwawet, the heir of Senwy, the son of Osiris."⁴

It is of interest to note that Wepwawet was closely associated with the king, particularly in the Sed festival, and this god's standard accompanied the king throughout the part of the ceremony, known as "The Dedication of the Field", in which the king symbolically asserted his domination over the land of Egypt by walking swiftly across a piece of land dedicated to the gods.⁵ However, Otto⁶ suggests that the story that it was a son of Osiris who gave his name to Macedonia, homeland of the Ptolemies, is nothing but an example of tact and diplomacy on the part of Hecataeus of Abdera.⁷

18.2 The Egyptian god Min was identified by the Greeks with their own Pan. Min was in origin an extremely ancient god,⁸ possibly considered to be the creator of the world, and he was often identified

tisme", *Aegyptus*, XXX, 1950, 57-66) and may have provided the means for its association with Osiris.

¹ P. Jumilhac, 4.1; 6.3; see Vandier, *Le Papyrus Jumilhac*, p. 155, n. 130.

² Vandier, *Jumilhac*, p. 32 and 102.

³ See below chs. 87.2; 88.5.

⁴ De Buck, *Coffin Texts*, I, 194a-b.

⁵ Frankfort, *Kingship and the Gods*, p. 85f.

⁶ *Priester und Tempel*, II, p. 268, n. 2.

⁷ See also below ch. 20.3.

⁸ See above ch. 11, and Bonnet, *Reallexikon*, s.v. Min.

with Horus.¹ By Classical times Min was chiefly worshipped as the protector of the road to Arabia and of travellers.

18.2 Chemmo was the capital of the IXth Upper Egyptian nome, most commonly known by its Egyptian name *'Ipw*. From its sacred name *Hnt(y) Mnw*, later *Hn Mnw*, "the place of the god Min", (Coptic *ⲙⲏⲙ* or *ⲭⲏⲙ*, hence the Arabic Akhmim) came the Greek form Chemmo or Chemmis (Herod., II, 91). Since Min was identified with Pan, the city was also known to the Greeks as Πανὸς πόλις or Πανῶν πόλις.²

18.2 Maron was associated with Dionysus and Bacchus, and, through their identification with Osiris, with the latter also. He was reputed to have accompanied Dionysus on his trip to India. According to Athenaeus, I, 33d, both Lake Marea and the village of that name near Alexandria, a famous wine-producing area, took their name from Maron.

18.3 That it was the custom of the Egyptians travelling abroad to grow their hair is completely unsubstantiated. The only possible Egyptian reference to such a practice occurs in the story of Sinuhe.³ But the translation, "I was shaved and my hair was combed" is not completely certain, although the meaning must be close to this. As Gardiner says, this cannot be considered to be confirmation of Diodorus, since Sinuhe must have grown his hair to conform to the habits of the barbarians. Furthermore, Diodorus implies that the traveller's hair was cut again after his return, while Sinuhe's was apparently merely combed.

Possibly the purpose of growing one's hair when abroad was to cut it off after the journey and the return to Egypt had been safely accomplished, and to dedicate it (or its weight in gold or silver, cf. below ch. 83.2) to the gods in thanks.

18.4 Pietschmann, "Die Satyrn des Osiris", ZÄS, XXXI, 1893, 73-74, suggests that there was an Egyptian parallel for the satyrs in

¹ Gardiner, *Ancient Egyptian Onomastica*, II, p. 28*, 40*f.; Černý, *Ancient Egyptian Religion*, p. 56.

² Cf. Strabo, XVII, 1.41; Ptolemy *Geography*, IV, 5.72; Gardiner, *Anc. Eg. On.*, II, p. 40*f.; Gauthier, *Dictionnaire Géographique*, IV, p. 177.

³ Gardiner, *Notes on the Story of Sinuhe*, p. 111, 1.290 and n. 3.

the *dnḡ* of the dance of the god.¹ At a later date the Egyptian god Bes was identified with the Classical Silenus and thus was connected with the satyrs. Bes was in any case closely associated with dancing and music in his own right.²

CHAPTER 19

19.1 The reappearance of the star Sirius, or Sothis, in the early morning just before the sun rose, seventy days after its disappearance from the sky, did in fact herald the season of inundation.³

19.1f. The story told here of Prometheus and Herakles is totally divorced from the usual Greek tradition,⁴ but it is difficult to determine what, if any, foundation there is for the story in Egyptian mythology. Herakles was usually identified with either Khons, Shu, or Herishef, of none of whom is a similar story told;⁵ although it may be significant that Herishef was in all probability a Nile god.⁶ His principal sanctuary was at Heracleopolis Magna (*Nn-nsḡ*), a town closely associated with the Fayûm.⁷

The Greeks seem generally to have identified their own Prometheus with the Egyptian god Nefertem, possibly only because the father of the latter was Ptah (Hephaestus), the discoverer of fire.

¹ See also Erman, "Zu den Inschriften des *Hr-hwḡ*", *ZAS*, XXX, 1892, 78-83; cf. Plutarch, *DIO*, 14. For the early association of the Satyrs with Dionysus, see *OCD*², s.v. Satyrs and Sileni; Pickard-Cambridge, *Dithyramb*, passim.

² T. M. Davis, *The Tomb of Iouiya and Touiyou*, p. 39f.; F. Jesi, "Bes e Sileno", *Aegyptus*, XLII, 1962, 257-275; Bonnet, *Reallexikon*, s.v. Bes.

³ See below ch. 50.2; also Merkelbach, *Isisfeste in griechisch-römischer Zeit*, p. 9.

⁴ It is also attributed to Agroitas, a writer of the IIIrd and IIInd century B.C., see introduction p. 11f.; and *FGrH*, 31, F 30 = Schol. Apoll. Rhod., II, 1248.

⁵ Unless indeed the story has any connection with that on the stele of Bentresh, a composition of the Ptolemaic era, though set in the time of Ramesses II. According to this the statue of Khons of Thebes was taken to Bakhtan to cure the sister of Ramesses II's wife, who was possessed by a demon. The statue was kept by the King of Bakhtan until Khons appeared in a dream as a golden hawk flying towards Egypt, when the King thought it prudent to return the statue. See Breasted, *AR*, III, 429-447.

⁶ His name means "He who is upon his lake."

⁷ Kees, *Ancient Egypt*, p. 214.

This would give Prometheus a tenuous connection with Memphis, a city apparently subject to flooding,¹ and Nefertem was in any case associated with the primordial waters. Is it possible then that the story represents an actual instance of a severe Nile flood, presumably in the vicinity of Memphis or of the Fayûm? But the associations are very vague, nor do they shed any light on the identity of the characters involved. It seems almost more probable that the story was originally inspired by the passage in Plato, *Timaeus*, 22D where the Egyptian priest tells Solon that in the regular conflagrations of the earth, Egypt is always saved from destruction by an inundation of the Nile, bearing in mind Prometheus' association with fire.

There is no evidence that the Nile was ever called Ἀετός. In Homer it is called ὁ Αἰγυπτός, and the quotation is from *Od.*, XIV, 258. The earliest mention of ὁ Νεῖλος is Hesiod, *Theog.*, 338. It is suggested by Taverna, "Sull'origine del nome Νεῖλος", *Aegyptus*, XLVIII, 1-4, 1968, 31-35, that this name has its origin in the Assyrian word Nâru, "river", introduced by the Assyrians when they conquered Egypt in the VIIIth-VIIth centuries B.C.

19.4 The site of the city of Thonis is uncertain. It was originally ascribed tentatively to the Metelite nome, or Middle Egypt near Heracleopolis Magna.² But Diodorus specifically says that it was situated where the river entered the sea. This is confirmed by Strabo, XVII, 1.16, who says that the city of Thonis existed in ancient times on the narrow strip of land between Pharos and the Canopic mouth.

19.5 The Nile was believed by the Egyptians to have its origin in a cavern at the border between Egypt and Ethiopia. The river was further believed to be the effluent of Osiris, hence the connection between the god and the southern boundary of Egypt, expressed here in a rational form.³

¹ See below ch. 50.4f. Prometheus is also named by Plutarch (*DIO*, 3) as father of Isis as an alternative to Hermes or Thoth (*Cf.* Ferguson in Scott, *Hermetica*, IV, p. 459). But Isis is usually called the daughter of Geb the earth-god, and it cannot be said that any association of her with Prometheus helps in the identification of the latter.

² Brugsch, *Dictionnaire Géographique*, p. 950; Gauthier, *Dictionnaire Géographique*, IV, p. 85.

³ See Kees, *Ancient Egypt*, p. 48.

19.7 The spread of civilization as far as India is undoubtedly attributed to Osiris or rather to Dionysus, as the result of Alexander the Great's march to the boundaries of India.

According to Arrian, *Anab.*, V, 1.1, there was indeed an Indian city of Nysa, founded by Dionysus and named in memory of his nurse, situated μεταξὺ τοῦ τε Κωφῆνος καὶ τοῦ Ἰνδοῦ ποταμοῦ.¹ Arrian confirms that this was the only place in India where ivy grew.

CHAPTER 20

20.1 There are many representations of the African elephant on prehistoric antiquities, and it played an important part in the early Naqada culture. It must have been familiar long before the 1st Dyn., and was doubtless hunted for its ivory. Unlike the other strong animals, the elephant is missing from the royal symbolism of the early dynastic period.² It is absent also from Egyptian mythology, but its name survives in the capital of the 1st Upper Egyptian nome, Abu, or Elephantine, which until the VIth Dyn. was often written with an elephant as a determinative. The name, however, appears to refer not to the elephants which must have inhabited the area in early times, but to the fact that the town was an emporium for ivory.

In the XVIIIth Dyn. Thutmose III undertook extensive military campaigns in Western Asia, and took part in a great (Indian) elephant hunt at Ny on the Euphrates. In a biographical inscription on the walls of his tomb at Thebes, the king's general Amenemheb records that the king hunted 120 elephants.³ Elephant hunting ap-

¹ Cf. above ch. 15.6. According to Bury, *History of Greece*, p. 801, it was near Jelalabad.

² The memory of the elephant, which apparently died out around the 1st Dyn., seems to have become confused with that of the rhinoceros. The resulting combination termed by Egyptologists "water-elephant" was subsequently placed by the Egyptians among their fabulous animals. See Keimer, "Note sur les rhinoceros de l'Égypte ancienne", *ASAE*, XLVIII, 1948, 47-54; Von Bissing, *Ägyptische Kunstgeschichte*, I, Band, p. 94 and n. 26; Kees, *Ancient Egypt*, p. 25; Paton, *Animals of Ancient Egypt*, p. 36; see also Váhala, "Der Elefant in Ägypten und Nubien", *ZAS*, LXXXVIII, 1970, 81-83.

³ Dawson, "The Earliest Records of the Elephant", *Annals and Magazine of Natural History*, ser. 9, XVI, 1925, 655.

pears to have become increasingly popular, and Strabo, XVI, 4.5, records that Ptolemy II sent Satyrus to investigate the sport. If Hecataeus is the source for this section, it may be that it was as a compliment to Ptolemy that he credited Osiris with enjoyment of this sport. Certainly Ptolemy II made it his business to organize the capture of African elephants in the South. These were for use in the elephant corps, first known to the Greeks after Alexander the Great invaded India. The Adulis inscription mentions the procuring of elephants from the South among the great deeds of Ptolemy III.¹ But the African elephant was harder to train than the Indian, and its use was gradually abandoned by the later Ptolemies.

20.1 Lycurgus appears in the Dionysian legend as a Thracian king who refuses to accept the cult of Dionysus.² It is perhaps relevant to the question of the origin³ of the Dionysian cult to note that in stories which record opposition in Thrace itself to the cult of Dionysus, the religion is already established; whereas, where the stories record opposition in Greece, it is definitely the introduction of the cult which is opposed.⁴

20.2 Maroneia was a city on the south coast of Thrace, celebrated for its excellent wine. This, together with other places on the Thracian coast, came under Egyptian rule when it was conquered by Ptolemy III.⁵ By 200 B.C. it had been captured by Macedon under Philip III, and remained a bone of contention until declared free by Rome in 167 B.C. This may suggest that Diodorus' source is to be dated to the brief period of Egyptian domination of this city, or to the interval 200-167 B.C., when Egypt was striving for repossession. The intention is obviously to establish an ancient connection between Egypt and Maroneia.

20.3 For the connection between Macedon and Osiris/Dionysus see also above ch. 18.1. The Ptolemies believed themselves to be

¹ Bevan, *History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty*, p. 175ff.

² *Il.*, VI, 130ff. (though he is not specifically called Thracian here); Soph., *Ant.*, 955. For a summary of the various descriptions of Lycurgus' punishment and death, see Dodds, *Euripides' Bacchae*, p. xxvf.

³ See below ch. 22.7.

⁴ E.g. Euripides, *Bacchae*; see Guthrie, *The Greeks and their Gods*, p. 175.

⁵ Polybius, V, 34.

descended from Dionysus, and Diodorus is presumably attempting to substantiate this belief, while at the same time establishing a direct connection between the Ptolemies and Egypt. If Dionysus is to be equated with Osiris, then the Ptolemies are the direct descendants of an Egyptian god and cannot be considered foreign intruders—a diplomatic suggestion.

The official version of the Ptolemaic family tree is given by Satyrus (FHG, III, 165): according to this the Ptolemies traced their ancestry back to Dionysus and Herakles through the mother of Ptolemy I, Arsinoë. The cult of Dionysus consequently enjoyed great popularity in Egypt under the Ptolemies.¹

20.4 For barley beer, see below ch. 34.

CHAPTER 21

21.2 For the story of Osiris, see above ch. 11. According to Plutarch, *DIO*, 18, the body of Osiris was divided into fourteen parts; and a list in the temple of Dendera² confirms that the number of parts and the nomes in which they lay was fourteen. But the same temple inscription also mentions sixteen parts.³ Eventually the traditional number was increased to forty-two, presumably because each nome now claimed to possess a sanctuary containing a fragment of the body of Osiris.⁴

21.3 Horus was the falcon-god of Egypt *par excellence*.⁵ Whereas all falcon-gods were not called Horus, all gods called Horus were falcon-gods, and there are about fifteen separate Horuses in the Egyptian pantheon. All these were originally endowed with different attributes and characteristics; thus it is important to distinguish Horus the Elder or Horus of Behdet (Edfu), from Horus the son of Isis and Osiris, or the infant Harpocrates. But because all these separate deities possessed the same name, their separate legends and

¹ Visser, *Götter und Kulte*, p. 35, and see below ch. 22.7.

² Dümichen, *Geogr. Inschr.*, III, 1.

³ Chassinat, *Le mystère d'Osiris*, 115, 3ff.

⁴ Cf. Chassinat, *Le temple d'Edfou*, I, 177, 6: "His body is in the forty-two nomes." Cf. also below ch. 97.2, and above p. 61.

⁵ See Bonnet, *Reallexikon*, s.v. Horus.

cults became hopelessly confused, until eventually Horus was felt to be a single god, the son of Osiris.

Although Horus is best known to us as the son of Isis and Osiris, the child who grew up to avenge the murder of this father by his enemy Seth, it is apparent that Horus did not originally belong to the Osirian cycle of legends. The Pyramid Texts attribute to various gods such as Geb and Thoth actions which they elsewhere attribute to Horus. Since it is more likely that Horus should have ousted these gods than *vice versa*, it is probable that Horus played no part in the original Osirian cycle. Moreover, the Horus of the Osirian myth is usually represented as a child, and even his later actions against Seth are to be seen as the direct outcome of his being the son of Osiris. There are adequate reasons for supposing that the Horus-Seth conflict, which plays a certain part in the Osiris myth, was in fact an entirely separate and much earlier episode, which later became incorporated into the Osirian cycle. The Horus of this conflict (usually called Horus the Elder to distinguish him from the son of Isis and Osiris) was a powerful god in his own right.

Originally Horus must have been an important sky-god, as his embodiment in the falcon indicates. Furthermore the name Horus probably means "he who is on high."¹ As a sky-god he was sometimes believed to have the sun and moon as his eyes, while at other times he was identified with the sun, particularly as Rē'-Harakhty.² There is evidence for the worship both of a falcon-god and of Seth in predynastic times, but the archaeological evidence may be interpreted as showing that Seth was the older of the two gods, while Horus was introduced by later invaders.³ It is more than probable that the Horus-Seth conflict, which according to Egyptian records was waged bitterly and brutally for many years and was only settled finally in a trial before a tribunal of the gods, represents an historical and political conflict between the followers of the two gods. Egyptian records of the conflict are obscure, but seem to suggest that the struggle and subsequent law-suit were basically concerned with

¹ Griffiths, *The Conflict of Horus and Seth*, p. 37.

² Bonnet, *Reallexikon*, s.v. Re, p. 626.

³ Seth was an important god for the Naqada I people; Horus seems to have been introduced by the Naqada II settlers: Baumgartel, *Cultures of Prehistoric Egypt*, I, p. 50f.

the sovereignty of Egypt. The astral and other interpretations must therefore be considered secondary to the historical. The date of the struggle remains uncertain.¹ What is clear is that it formed an historical basis for the myths.

The victory of Horus² as the guardian god of the people who became the rulers of Egypt was presumably responsible for the identification of Horus with the living king, and the establishment of Horus as the royal god *par excellence*. The royal Horus name was written inside the serekh³ surmounted by a falcon, and the falcon of Horus perched on a standard was used as the determinative for both gods and kings. But whereas the identification of the living king with Horus was ancient, dating back at least as far as the late Naqada II period, the identification of the dead king with Osiris was later. Horus, the living son of the dead king, now became the son of Osiris, and his enemies became the enemies of Osiris. It must have been this new relationship which caused the fusion of the Horus and Osiris myths, leading to the gradual emergence of Osiris from the realm of the dead into that of the living. The judgement of the tribunal of gods, which had in the earlier Horus-Seth cycle restored sovereignty to Horus, now restored to the resurrected Osiris the kingdom of which he had been robbed by Seth.

The genealogy of Horus is far from certain. By the time the Osirian religion became popular, Horus the Elder had become confused with the son of Osiris, but in the Pyramid Texts he is variously described as the son of Nut, of Geb, and perhaps of Hathor.⁴ It appears that the relationship between Horus and Hathor is very old, as the Horus-falcon and the Hathor-cow are both shown on the Narmer palette. More important, the name Hathor means

¹ Baumgartel, *op. cit.*, I, p. 47, suggests that it refers to the conquest of an Upper Egyptian town worshipping Seth by the Naqada II people, symbolised by Horus. But Griffiths, *The Conflict of Horus and Seth*, p. 141f., suggests four main stages in the conflict, all occurring in the predynastic period.

² Recorded by all the Egyptian sources. Even the Shabaka stone records that Geb was dissatisfied with his earlier verdict (which gave Lower Egypt to Horus, and Upper Egypt to Seth), and finally gave Horus sole sovereignty.

³ Baumgartel, *op. cit.*, I, p. 147, believes this to represent a throne, not a palace facade or doorway as is usually accepted.

⁴ Griffiths, *Conflict*, p. 13.

"house of Horus." Possibly Hathor was the mother of the Horus of the earlier Horus-Seth cycle, and when this was drawn into the Osirian cycle, she was displaced by Isis to bind the myths more closely. By Hellenistic times, Horus was regarded almost solely as a child, and, as the infant Harpocrates, was usually shown sucking his finger, or on the lap of his mother. It has been suggested that such representations may account for the early adoration of the Virgin and Child.¹

Diodorus says surprisingly little of the part played by Horus in the Osiris myth. He mentions only briefly his struggle with Seth, making more of his connection with oracles and healing.²

21.4 The village of Antaeus has been identified with the Egyptian *Ibw*, Coptic $\tau\kappa\omega\sigma\tau$, later $\tau\kappa\sigma\sigma\tau$, the village of Kaw el-Kebir, which survived until the beginning of the nineteenth century. The god of the Xth Upper Egyptian nome, in which the village was situated, was *'ntywy*, whom it has been suggested the Greeks identified with the giant Antaeus solely on account of the similarity of the names.³ The god's name was written with two falcons, and there are instances where he is explicitly equated with Horus. Certainly it seems that he represented two deities fused into one. But there is further evidence that he was at all stages considered to be a form of Seth, the enemy of Horus.⁴ There is confirmation of this in several representations in which the god is shown accompanied by Nephthys, and there is perhaps more in the identification of *'ntywy* and Antaeus than mere similarity of name. The story told by Diodorus of the final struggle between Horus and Seth at this spot is supported by Egyptian evidence of epithets such as "the two 'Anty in the Aphroditopolite nome, who contended in this nome",⁵ and must surely have reminded the Greeks of the struggle between Herakles and Antaeus.

21.5ff. In the Egyptian tradition Isis healed and revived the

¹ Černý, *Ancient Egyptian Religion*, p. 148. See above p. 63.

² See below ch. 25.7.

³ Sethe, *Urgeschichte*, esp. ch. 53; Gauthier, *Dictionnaire Géographique*, IV, p. 75; Gardiner, *Ancient Egyptian Onomastica*, II, p. 18*f. and p. 49*ff.

⁴ Gardiner, *Anc. Eg. On.*, II, p. 53*.

⁵ Brugsch, *Géographische Inschriften*, I, p. 22. See also Griffiths, *Conflict*, p. 99.

dead Osiris,¹ and did not simply bury the parts as Diodorus and Plutarch² both record. However, Diodorus seems to be referring to the Egyptian tradition in ch. 25.6, where Horus is almost certainly to be taken as Osiris.

Exactly what Diodorus has in mind when he describes the wax figures modelled by Isis, it is difficult to say. Perhaps the most plausible explanation is that Diodorus misinterpreted the "corn-Osiris" figures. A description of two such figures can be found in Lortet and Gaillard, *La faune momifiée*, IV, p. 209-213: constructed of wax, resin and bitumen, these figures were filled with sand and grain, intended to germinate and to represent resurrection. Several wax masks of Osiris, obviously intended for such figures have also been found.³ The figures were usually quite small, the ones described above being fifty centimetres high. They were occasionally accompanied by figures of the four sons of Horus, made in the same way, and also containing sand and grain.

Alternatively it may be to figures of the four sons of Horus themselves that Diodorus is referring. Normally the viscera of mummies were stored in canopic jars representing these deities. But with the change in the method of mummification in the XXIst Dyn.,⁴ the use of canopic jars was temporarily abandoned. The viscera were now returned to the body cavity, but so that they remained under the protection of the sons of Horus, small wax figures of these gods were wrapped in, or placed near the packages of viscera.⁵

But in Porphyry, *De Abstinencia*, II, 55 we find a clear reference to the use of wax figures in sacrificial ritual: κατέλυσε δὲ καὶ ἐν Ἑλίου πόλει τῆς Αἰγύπτου τὸν τῆς ἀνθρωποκτονίας νόμον Ἀμωσις, ὡς μαρτυρεῖ Μανεθὼς ἐν τῷ περὶ ἀρχαϊσμοῦ καὶ εὐσεβείας· ἐθύοντο δὲ τῇ Ἡρᾷ . . . ἐθύοντο δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας τρεῖς ἀνθ' ὧν κηρίνους ἐκέλευσεν ὁ Ἀμωσις τοὺς ἵσους ἐπιτίθεσθαι.⁶ However, there is no Egyptian evi-

¹ Faulkner, "The Bremner-Rhind Papyrus I", *JEA*, XXII, 1936, 121-140, esp. 130f.

² *DIO*, 18.

³ Lortet and Gaillard, *op. cit.*, III, p. 75-78; IV, p. 209f.

⁴ See below ch. 91.

⁵ Williams, "The Egyptian Collection in the Museum of Art at Cleveland, Ohio", *JEA*, V, 1918, 272-285; Lucas, *Ancient Egyptian Materials and Industries*⁴, p. 337.

⁶ See above p. 14, and below ch. 67.11.

dence to support this. There is, on the other hand, definite evidence for the use of wax figures in magic. The earliest example occurs in the first story of P. Westcar,¹ the phrasing of which seems to suggest that the wax figure of the crocodile was used frequently.² This is, however, only a story. But in the XVIIIth Dyn. a superintendant of the king's cattle was prosecuted for making wax figures of men and women with which he practised sympathetic magic, causing his victims to fall ill.³ According to Pseudo-Callisthenes,⁴ Nectanebo II also used wax figures for magical purposes, as did Alexander the Great.⁵ And an Egyptian papyrus of the IVth century B.C. gives details of the use of wax figures in what is definitely a religious context: the "Book of Felling Apophis" stipulates the destruction of figures of this and other enemies of Rē', to enable Rē' to travel in safety.⁶ And there is similar evidence for the use of wax figures in the cursing of Seth in a text⁷ the superscription of which suggests that the ritual was performed daily in the temple of Osiris at Abydos and in other Egyptian temples.

21.7 The statement that one-third of Egyptian land revenue was reserved for the temples⁸ must, in the view of Otto, *Priester und Tempel*, I, p. 262f., refer to the pharaonic period and be taken from Hecataeus of Abdera. But it is doubtful whether it is accurate: it is certainly too high for the Ptolemaic and Roman periods.⁹

Many of the temple estates were acquired by gift of the king.¹⁰ In the Ptolemaic period the wealth of the temples increased the power of the priests in control of them. But much of this wealth

¹ Léfèbvre, *Romans et contes égyptiens*, p. 74-77.

² Budge, *Book of the Dead*, (Trans.), p. CLI.

³ Chabas, *Le papyrus magique Harris*, p. 170ff.

⁴ Ed. Müller, I, i.

⁵ Budge, *op. cit.*, p. CLIIff.

⁶ Faulkner, "The Bremner-Rhind Papyrus III", *JEA*, XXIII, 1937, 166-185.

⁷ *Urkunden*, VI (*Urkunden mythologischen Inhalts*, ed. Schott, Leipzig, 1929, p. 4-59). Cf. Te Velde, *Seth, God of Confusion*, p. 150.

⁸ See also below ch. 73.2f.

⁹ Cf. Kees, *Ägypten*, p. 44f.; and more generally, Drioton-Vandier, *L'Égypte*⁴, p. 586f.

¹⁰ E.g. Nectanebo II, see Kienitz, *Die politische Geschichte Ägyptens vom 7 bis zum 4 Jahrhundert vor der Zeitwende*, p. 125f.

was borrowed or confiscated by Cleopatra for her struggle against Rome.¹ Nevertheless Augustus could still fear the influence of the priests in fomenting a nationalist uprising against the Romans.

21.10 For Apis and Mnevis see below chs. 84.4 and 88.4. The ultimate reason for the worship of these animals was probably not their use in agriculture, but the fact that they represented the fertile principle.

CHAPTER 22

22.2 It is possible that originally Osiris was believed to be buried in one place, perhaps Abydos.² After the XVIIIth Dyn. the tomb of king Djer of the Ist Dyn. was thought to be the tomb of Osiris,³ and the earliest allusions to the individual burials of parts of the dismembered body also date from this period.⁴

22.3-6 The association of Isis and Osiris with the island of Philae, south of Aswân, is relatively late. Although the place was considered sacred at an early period of Egyptian history, the magnificent temples for which it was famous were not built until after the time of Nectanebo I (mid IVth century B.C.). The most important of these temples, deriving mainly from the time of the early Ptolemies, was dedicated to Isis and remained in use until the Vth century A.D.; and Isis was still revered at Philae as late as the VIth century A.D.

The tradition that Isis and Osiris were buried on this island has been examined by Junker, *Das Götterdekret über das Abaton*. The tomb of Osiris was in fact believed to be on the granite island of Bigeh, but there must have been some confusion between Philae and Bigeh. Certainly texts in the temple at Philae are concerned with the vigil of Isis and Nephthys over the bier of Osiris.⁵

¹ Johnson, *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, Vol. II, *Roman Egypt*, p. 639.

² Cf. Plutarch, *DIO*, 18.

³ Petrie, *Royal Tombs*, I, 7; II, 8; cf. Amélineau, *Le tombeau d'Osiris*, p. 149f.

⁴ See Griffiths, *Plutarch*, p. 341f.

⁵ Junker, *Der grosse Pylon des Tempels der Isis in Philä; Die Stundenwachen in den Osirismysterien*.

ἱερὸν πεδῖον or "Holy Field" could be a plausible translation of the Egyptian terms *iw w'b* "holy island" or *ibt w'bt* "holy mound", which are used indiscriminately in the texts and from which the name Abaton in this context may be derived. *ibt* is the technical term for the grave mound of Osiris. Plutarch, *DIO*, 20 also records that the place was unapproachable, although the priests had access for the annual funerary festival, and this is confirmed by the Egyptian text: "And no man is ever allowed to approach there."¹

There is no doubt that the ritual involved both lamentation² and milk offerings,³ as Diodorus says. The ritual was performed daily, thus Junker, *D. II*, 17-20, and *D. I*, 38-40: "Alltglich soll das Gottesritual darin vollzogen werden von dem grossen Priester, der den Monatsdienst hat. Das *kbhw* der Isis, der Herrin von Philae, soll dabei tglich als Libation verwendet werden." *kbhw* is in fact usually to be translated "cold water"; here it is probably to be translated "milk." Diodorus mentions 360 bowls, but according to the texts there were 365;⁴ thus Junker, *D. I*, 34-7: "Man soll ihm 365 Opfertafeln machen rund um diese Sttte und es sollen Palmbltter auf ihnen liegen. Nie soll die Libation auf ihnen zu Ende gehen, und in seinem ganzen Umkreis soll das Wasser nicht alle werden."⁵

22.6 For the oath, cf. also Tzetzes, *ad Lykoph. Cassandram*: ἐν Φίλαις δὲ πάλαι Αἰγύπτου τὸ μέγιστον ἦν τῶν ἱερῶν ὅς καὶ μέγας ὄρκος τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις ἐτύγγανε μὰ τὸν ἐν Φίλαις Ὀσίριν λέγουσιν.

22.6 While there is an Egyptian reference to the drowning of Osiris in a fragmentary inscription of the time of Shabaka of the

¹ Junker, *Abaton*, 69ff.

² This is not actually specified in the texts, which do, however, forbid music and sport there.

³ Milk was commonly used in ritual. See Gardiner, "Tuthmosis III returns thanks to Amun", *JEA*, XXXVIII, 1952, 15, where is recorded the dedication by Thutmose of foreign cattle to supply milk for temple services. The exact use to which the milk was put in this case is unknown, but S. Schott, "Das Lschen von Fackeln in Milch", *ZS*, LXXIII, 1937, 1-25 shows the existence of a ceremony in which four priests extinguished the flame of a torch in basins or troughs filled with milk. See also Bonnet, *Reallexikon*, s.v. Milch.

⁴ Confirmed by P. Berlin, 8351, v, 9-10.

⁵ Cf. also *D. I*, 31: "Die Milch soll nicht aufhren an dieser Sttte."

XXVth Dyn.,¹ there is no specific reference to the loss of Osiris' phallus in the Nile.² In Egyptian mythology it is the testicles of Seth rather than of Osiris which play a considerable part.³ Nevertheless there are references to the phallus of Osiris in the festival songs of Isis and Nephthys.⁴ But perhaps the most important comparison is to be made between Osiris and Bata in "The Tale of Two Brothers".⁵ According to this story, Bata cut off his own phallus (to maintain his innocence) and cast it into the river, where it was eaten by a fish.

As for Egyptian rites and sacrifices, there is no evidence to suggest that the phallus played an important part in them, although Min and Bes, and occasionally Osiris, were represented as ithyphallic.⁶ Maspero, *Les Momies Royales de Deir el Bahari*, p. 556, 563, 566, suggests that the genitals of certain kings were removed after their death and separately embalmed, probably in wooden and gilded statuettes of Osiris.

22.7 According to Diodorus it was Orpheus who imported the cult of Dionysus from Egypt into Greece. This origin is supported by Foucart⁷ but rejected by Farnell.⁸ However the identification of Dionysus and Osiris must have been assisted by the fact that both were pioneers of civilization⁹ and that both were associated with corn. Under the Ptolemies the cult of Dionysus became very popu-

¹ See above p. 60, and below ch. 92.5. Cf. also Pyr., 24d; 615d; 766d.

² Cf. Plutarch, *DIO*, 18 and 36, where Osiris is thus directly related to the fertilizing force of the Nile. In fact the phallus of Osiris was believed to be preserved in Mendes (Brugsch, *Dic. Géog.*, 219; cf. Strabo, XVII, 802; P. Jumilhac, B. 4, 20ff., and Vandier, *Jumilhac*, p. 232, n. 887). For the rescue of Osiris' viscera from the waters, see Wallis Budge, *Osiris and the Egyptian Resurrection*, I, p. 63; Moret, *Le Rituel du Culte Divin Journalier*, p. 37-41, 49, n. 2.

³ See Griffiths, *The Conflict of Horus and Seth*; Te Velde, *Seth, God of Confusion*.

⁴ Wallis Budge, "On the Hieratic Papyrus of Nesi-Amen", *Archaeologia*, LII, 1890, 393-608; Faulkner, "The Bremner-Rhind Papyrus I", *JEA*, XXII, 1936, 121-140.

⁵ 7.9ff. See Maspero, *Contes populaires d'Égypte ancienne*, p. 10.

⁶ See Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols*, VI, 71-90 for Egyptian phallicism, although its importance in the Osirian religion is perhaps exaggerated.

⁷ *Le Culte de Dionysos en Attique*, Mem. Acad. des Inscr., 37, 1906.

⁸ *Cults of the Greek City States*, III, 141ff.

⁹ Plutarch, *DIO*, 13. Herod., II, 48, ascribes phallic elements to both cults.

lar,¹ and its mysteries were widespread in Egypt in the IIIrd century B.C.²

The country of origin of the orgiastic Dionysiac cult has still not been determined with absolute finality. Gruppe³ argued that Dionysus was one of the oldest gods in Greece, and that if he was worshipped by the Thracians, then his cult was introduced into Thrace by Greek settlers. Otto⁴ also argued that Dionysus was essentially and from the beginning a god of the Greeks. But the consensus of opinion, both in antiquity and today is that he was of Thracian origin,⁵ and probably entered Greece from the north; although there may have been a parallel invasion from Asia Minor by way of the Greek islands.⁶

The date of introduction of the cult can only be guessed. Herodotus (II, 49) calls it νεωστὶ ἐσηγμένα,⁷ apparently referring to the time of Melampus before the Trojan War. In general the Greeks do seem to have regarded Dionysus as a more recent god than their original Olympians, though he was soon adopted into the pantheon (without, however, entirely assuming an Olympian character). But his original arrival in Greece must be considerably earlier than some have thought⁸: Ventriss and Chadwick⁹ have published a fragmentary Pylos tablet containing the name Di-wo-nu-so-jo. While this may not be the name of the god, it seems to imply knowledge of the god's name at least as early as the XIIIth century B.C. This tablet is accepted by Astour, *Hellenosemitica*, p. 177, as proof posi-

¹ Ptolemy Philadelphus in particular was devoted to the cult, and was responsible for organizing an outstanding Dionysiac procession: Athenaeus, V, 197c-201b; Nilsson, *Dionysiac Mysteries of the Hellenistic and Roman Age*, p. 11f.; *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*, II, 153, n. 2.

² Boardman, *JHS*, LXXVIII, 1958, 4-12, suggests that there may be evidence for Dionysiac phallic processions in Egypt in the VIth century B.C.

³ *Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte*, II, 1409f.

⁴ *Dionysus: Mythos und Kultus* p. 51ff.

⁵ This is not incompatible with the Phrygian origin of his mother Semele, since the Thracians and Phrygians were of the same stock: Guthrie, *The Greeks and their Gods*, p. 154.

⁶ Guthrie, *op. cit.*, p. 155; Dodds, *Euripides Bacchae*, p. xix.

⁷ Cf. Euripides, *Bacchae*, 219, 272.

⁸ Cf. Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, ch. VIII, 363-463 and Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Der Glaube der Hellenen*, II, 59-62, who believe it to have been as late as the VIIIth century B.C.

⁹ *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*, p. 127.

tive of the theory of Gruppe and Otto,¹ but as Dodds points out,² the tablet does not necessarily mean that the myths of the introduction of the cult are historically without foundation: they must simply refer to a very remote period—unless the Archaic Age saw the reintroduction from abroad of ideas known to the Minoan world.³

CHAPTER 23

23.2 The exact nature of Orphism, and indeed whether it even existed, are still questions for debate. The inconclusive evidence is open to subjective interpretation, and it is unlikely that there will ever be total agreement among scholars.⁴

Initially one must distinguish between the legendary figure of Orpheus, and the religious movement which later appropriated his name. One is faced immediately with the apparent paradox that while the central god of the Orphic religion is undoubtedly Dionysus, nevertheless, according to at least one legend, Orpheus came into conflict with Dionysus in Thrace: he angered the god by persisting in his worship of Apollo, with the result that he was torn to death by order of the jealous Dionysus.⁵ And as Guthrie⁶ points out, Orpheus is in character virtually indistinguishable from Apollo: his gentleness, his musicianship, and his general civilizing influence all resemble the characteristics of the god. Thus Guthrie sees in Orpheus a dedicated follower, perhaps even a missionary priest, of Apollo. And, although later writers refer to Orpheus freely as a

¹ And furthermore as proof of his own theory concerning the Semitic origins of Dionysus.

² *op. cit.*, p. xxi, n. 3.

³ Nilsson, *Minoan-Mycenaean Religion*², p. 575ff.

⁴ See Rohde, *Psyche* (Trans. W. B. Hillis), ch. X; Guthrie, *Orpheus and Greek Religion* and *The Greeks and their Gods*, believes that the Orphic doctrine had already been formulated as a religion in the VIth century B.C.; Linforth, *The Arts of Orpheus*, doubts this, maintaining that before 300 B.C. the term "Orphic" was used loosely to describe all kinds of *teletae* and mysteries; see also Kirk and Raven, *The Presocratic Philosophers*, p. 37-48; Jaeger, *Theology of the Early Greek Philosophers*, ch. 4; Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational*, p. 147f.

⁵ Aeschylus, *Bassarids*, ap. Kern, *Orph. frag.*, 113, p. 33. For a different interpretation of the evidence, see Guépin, *The Tragic Paradox*, p. 227f.

⁶ *Orpheus*, p. 29f., 40ff.; *The Greeks and their Gods*, p. 315.

Thracian, the earlier evidence suggests rather that he was a Greek living in Thrace, but continuing to follow the calm, rational Apolline religion of the Greeks.¹ It is hardly surprising then that he should have come into conflict with the irrational and orgiastic native religion of Dionysus.

But it is an indisputable fact that from the time of Herodotus onwards, the Orphic religion was considered to be Bacchic. Guthrie² suggests that followers of Orpheus may have adopted the cult of Thrace, at the same time modifying it by the addition of both Apolline features and others that were original and may be called, therefore, Orphic. Rohde, however, had earlier suggested³ that the Dionysiac cult may already have been accepted in Greece and modified by Greek thought, but was now subject to a secondary wave of Thracian influence. It must be said that the chronological stages of the development of this religion remain obscure. But it is true to say that the Orphic religion stood, in the words of Guthrie,⁴ for "a blend of the Thracian belief in immortality with Apolline ideas of katharsis. From the one it took ekstasis, enthusiasm and a deep spiritual hope; from the other a formalizing influence, an almost legal atmosphere of rules and regulations."

The result of this amalgamation, the Orphic religion, does not seem to have taken shape before the VIth century B.C., and it made its appearance not in Thrace, but in southern Italy or Athens.⁵ However, there is sufficient evidence for the interaction of the Apolline and Dionysiac religions long before this date; from the first introduction of the Dionysiac cult into Greece, it seems to have been subject to influence from the more rational Apolline cult. Moreover the two cults are found side by side at Delphi.⁶ There is no reason then to doubt that the leaders of the mystical sects could have adopted as their founder a hero of antiquity closely connected with the Apolline cult, presumably acquainted with the Dionysiac

¹ Guthrie, *The Greeks and their Gods*, p. 315f.; *Orpheus*, ch. III.

² *Orpheus*, p. 44.

³ *Psyche*, p. 336.

⁴ *The Greeks and their Gods*, p. 318.

⁵ Guthrie, *Orpheus*, p. 46f.

⁶ Homer, *Od.*, IX, 197ff. and Schol.; Euripides, *Cyclops*, 141ff.; see Rohde, *Psyche*, p. 288; Guthrie, *loc. cit.*

religion, and, from the evidence, himself inclined towards mysticism. And in spite of the fact that Greek legend records conflict between Orpheus and Dionysus, the cults of Apollo and Dionysus became so compatible that in Greek tradition Orpheus actually became the founder of the Dionysiac initiation mysteries.¹

That Diodorus should record that Orpheus introduced the mysteries at Thebes is entirely natural, since by the Vth century B.C. Thebes was regarded as the centre of the cult in Greece²—though even here there must have been resistance to the cult if one is to believe the legend dramatized in Euripides' *Bacchae*. Like the cult of Dionysus, Orphism also appears to have been known in Egypt, but obviously it was not indigenous.³

23.2ff. The variation of the legend of Cadmus given here bears little relation to the more common versions of the story. According to Greek tradition, Cadmus had no connection whatever with Egypt but was a Phoenician; and although this has been disputed it seems to be the case, at least in the later stages of the development of the story.⁴ It is difficult therefore to imagine the source of Diodorus' information. It is true that Cadmus is said to be the son of Agenor, and thus is cousin to Danaus whom later genealogies make the nephew of Agenor. But it seems improbable that this tenuous association with the descendants of Io in Egypt (even supported by the existence of an Egyptian Thebes) is the only basis for the elaborate version of the Cadmus story given by Diodorus.⁵

Traditionally, Cadmus arrived in Greece from Phoenicia, searching for his sister Europa who had been abducted by Zeus. Here in Boeotia he founded the city of Thebes and ruled it as its king. The story is obviously comparable with that of Danaus who was also

¹ For the Classical evidence, see Rohde, *Psyche*, p. 348, n. 1. The two gods in fact became confused later, the same titles referring to both. This is particularly true of their positions as leaders of artistic and intellectual life. (Lauer and Picard, *Les statues ptolémaïques du Serapieion de Memphis*, o. 42).

² Guthrie, *The Greeks and their Gods*, p. 166.

³ Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*, II, 232, n. 2.

⁴ In fact Cadmus appears to belong originally to Thebes, only acquiring oriental affinities around 650-550 B.C., in common with certain other Greeks. (See Vian, *Les origines de Thèbes, Cadmos et les Spartes*, p. 68f.)

⁵ Though Latte, in *RE*, X, 2, 1471, believes it to be sufficient cause.

said to be a foreign invader,¹ and must presumably be based on some historical reality, although it cannot at present be related to the archaeological evidence.² Of the Greek tradition, however, Diodorus says nothing, describing Cadmus only as a citizen of Egyptian Thebes, and giving no explanation of how Cadmus or his descendants came to be living in Greek Thebes (if it is indeed the Greek city to which he refers in 23.7).

23.4 The part played by Semele in this story, like that of Cadmus, bears little relation to the accepted Greek tradition. According to the latter, Semele was wooed by Zeus, but was persuaded by the jealous Hera to beg him to visit her in all his majesty. This he did, and Semele, unable to withstand the thunderbolt, perished. The unborn child she was carrying was rescued by Zeus and concealed in his thigh until ready to be born. Diodorus' version of the story is a masterpiece of rationalization: Semele's violation by an unknown man, the suggestion that the law of nature as opposed to the will of the gods is responsible for the high mortality rate among premature babies, the fact that Cadmus ascribes paternity to Zeus in order to preserve his daughter's reputation, all suggest a more sceptical attitude towards religion.

The etymology of the name Semele, and with it the origins of the goddess, have long been uncertain, but it is widely accepted that she was a Phrygian earth-goddess (whose name occurs as *Zemelo* in inscriptions), and is probably to be considered as a form of the Anatolian earth-mother.³ Though in origin immortal, in Dionysian legend Semele becomes a mortal princess of Thebes.⁴

¹ See below ch. 28.

² In recent years, however, a discovery was made in the Mycenaean palace at Thebes on the Cadmeia, of thirty-seven cylinder seals, all but three of which are Babylonian and Syrian. One of the seals can be dated to the reign of the Kassite king Burnaburiash, 1381-1354 B.C. The find proves that Thebes, though not a port, had some connections with Syria and Mesopotamia, and suggests that the Greek legend may have some historical foundation. For a preliminary report on the find, see Palmer and Gurney, "New Light Thrown on Ancient Crete", *The Times*, July 17th, 1964.

³ Guthrie, *The Greeks and their Gods*, p. 154; Dodds, *Euripides' Bacchae*, p. 63f.; Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*, I, p. 535.

⁴ Later redeified: Hesiod, *Theog.*, 940ff.

It has, however, been suggested¹ that Semele is to be equated with the Semitic eagle-mother, *Sml*, a goddess of the Ugaritic pantheon. This goddess was said to have devoured Aqht, whose father Danel thereupon prayed to Ba'al to break the eagle-mother's wings and thus kill her, so that he might recover his son's remains. This may, I suppose, be said to bear some slight resemblance to the Greek myth of Semele. But Astour considers the identity of the goddess to be proved beyond dispute by the unique version of the story told by Hyginus, *Fabulae*, 167. According to this, Liber (Dionysus) was dismembered by Titans, and his heart was given by Jupiter to Semele in a drink, with the result that she became pregnant. In fact this version is closer to a similar episode in the Egyptian *Tale of Two Brothers*² than it is to the story of *Sml*, and although Astour's theory is attractive, it should be treated with caution.

CHAPTER 24

24.1 Herakles is perhaps the most important hero of Greek mythology. His origin is obscure, but his popularity seems to have been instantaneous, and he attracted to himself a wealth of stories. He was believed to be a contemporary of the Argonauts and of Laomedon, father of Priam of Troy. Although he was thought to have travelled to the ends of the earth, virtually his only connection with Egypt is to be found in the tradition which makes him the slayer of Busiris, and this appears to be relatively late.³

Herakles must have been, at least in Greece itself,⁴ a hero rather than a god, although he acquired a cult and was worshipped as a god: but his name is theophoric, and no Greek god was ever named from another. In origin he is probably to be regarded as legendary, rather than mythical: the man behind the tradition may well have been lord of Tiryns, and as such might have been subject to the

¹ Astour, *Hellenosemitica*, p. 169-173.

² The elder brother revives the corpse of the younger by dissolving the latter's heart in a draught of water and giving it to the corpse to drink.

³ See in particular, Gruppe, in *RE*, Supp. III, 910-1121. For Busiris, see below ch. 67.11.

⁴ For his identification with foreign gods see Herod., II, 43f.; Arrian, *Anab.*, II, 16.4; Silius Italicus, III, 22-3.

overlordship of Argos, for the king of which city, Eurystheus, Herakles traditionally performed his labours. However, the stories of his birth and early life connect him also with Thebes in Boeotia, and it seems probable that he was here identified with a local hero, Alcaeus.

The ancients tend to distinguish between a god of this name and an historic hero. Such a distinction is made as early as the time of the author of the *Odyssey*, and Hesiod. Herodotus¹ also is unable to accept the identity of the Egyptian Herakles with the Greek of that name, because the former must have lived so many centuries before the latter. He suggests that the Greek must have been a mortal who took the name of the god.² Diodorus³ in fact distinguishes between three separate Herakles: the Egyptian, the son of Alcmene, and the Cretan Dactyl. And later still, yet more heroes of this name can be distinguished.

According to W. Brundage, "Herakles the Levantine", *JNES*, XVII, 1958, 225-236, Herakles was not of Greek but of Near Eastern origin: the first literary tradition comes from South-West Anatolia and its offshore islands. Peisandros of Rhodes (? mid VIIth century B.C.) was the first to depict Herakles not as a Bronze Age hoplite, but with the lion's skin and olive staff which became canonical during the VIth century. Brundage would see in Herakles a mixture of the wandering hero of the Babylonian epic of Gilgamesh, the cult of the dying and reviving Tyrian god, and the divine eponym of a line of Lydian priest-kings. He believes the ancestor of the royal line in Lydia to have been in fact Alcaeus by name; only after the cult reached the Anatolian coast from the hinterland, where Hebat was worshipped as Hera, did Alcaeus become Herakles. As far as the historical Herakles is concerned, Brundage sees him as a free-booter of Lydian origin, called Amphytryon, who appeared in the Argolid.

But whatever the origins of Herakles, and it must be admitted that they are confused, both Herodotus and Diodorus distinguish between an Egyptian and a Greek hero of the name, agreeing that

¹ II, 43f.; 145f.

² Refuted by Plutarch, *Mor.*, 857d, on the grounds of impiety.

³ III, 73.

the Egyptian Herakles is much older than the Greek. The Greeks commonly identified their Herakles with the Egyptian god Herishef or Harsaphes, a ram-headed god whose principal shrine was at Heracleopolis Magna in the Fayûm. Herishef was probably in origin a Nile god, like the other ram-headed gods, and was an object of veneration as early as the Ist Dyn. Herakles was also occasionally identified with Khons; the reason for this is unknown, but may be the result of the assimilation of Khons with Shu as Khons-Shu, and the consequent association of the idea of strength, since Shu was often depicted as thrusting apart Heaven and Earth in the form of Geb and Nut.¹

24.1 On a headland at or near Gades there stood a temple of "Herakles", in fact probably a shrine of Melkart.² The temple contained no cult statue, but two pillars. This may be compared with the Syrian form of Ba'al's house, consisting of a facade and lintel supported by two porch pillars; and the temple of Jahweh built for Solomon by the Tyrians contained two sacred pillars of bronze.

24.4 The etymology of the name Herakles is uncertain. Classical authors generally are divided between the choice of "Ἡρα + κλέος and "Ἡρα + ἄκλεος with the balance tipped perhaps slightly in favour of the former. *Etymologicon Magnum*, p. 435, 3ff.³, gives various etymologies, including the following: "Ἡ ὅτι Νεῖλος ἐκ γενετῆς καλούμενος ἐν τῷ κατὰ γιγάντων πολέμῳ ἀνώνυμον ἕνα τῶν γιγάντων πυρίπνοον ἐπερχόμενον "Ἡρᾶ φονεύσας, 'Ηρακλῆς ὠνομάσθη, which perhaps echoes his connection with Egypt. The true etymology of his name is possibly to be found in the stem *serv- (protect), or in the Sanskrit sâra-s, *sar- (strength).⁴

24.4 Matris of Thebes was the author of an 'Εγκώμιων 'Ηρακλέους. His date is uncertain, but may be placed in the IIIrd century B.C.

24.8 Perseus was certainly connected with Egypt from an early

¹ Bonnet, *Reallexikon*, s.v. Schu; see also above ch. 19.1.

² Arrian, *Anab.*, II, 16.4; Strabo, III, 5.3; also Diodorus, IV, 18, 4-7.

³ See also Zwicker, in *RE*, VIII, p. 523f.

⁴ *RE*, VIII, p. 525f.

date. In Herodotus, II, 91 he is connected with Libya and Africa by his slaying of the Gorgon.¹ Furthermore his rescue of Andromeda from the sea monster is traditionally placed in Ethiopia.² But at Chemmis he is definitely associated with the Egyptian god Horus.³

24.8 Isis or Isis-Hathor⁴ was represented as a woman with cow's horns, and thus the similarity between her and Io in her bovine form led to the identification of the two, although apparently not before the Hellenistic period. Stubbings, "The Rise of Mycenaean Civilization", *CAH*², II, ch. XIV suggests that there may be a trace of the cult of Hathor in that of Hera βοῶπις who was worshipped at the Argive Heraeum. But it is impossible to disentangle what recollections of Isis-Hathor there may be in the Io myth.⁵

CHAPTER 25

25.1f. In the Hellenistic era syncretism was in full swing, and the gods and goddesses here mentioned by Diodorus, with the possible exceptions of Zeus and Hera, were all identified with each other. However, the Egyptian Amūn (Zeus) was identified with Min (Pan) in the form Amūn-Min; and Min-Hor (the fused form of Min and Horus) was occasionally regarded as Osiris.⁶ Thus these inter-identifications are not impossible; and presumably Hera as the wife of Zeus-Amūn underwent the same process.

For the identification of Sarapis and Pluto see Plutarch, *DIO*, 28,⁷ where Timotheus and Manetho are mentioned as having conjectured it.⁸ Manetho is also the first to refer to Isis as the moon.⁹

It is surprising that Diodorus makes no more detailed reference

¹ Apoll. Rhod., IV, 1513-17 and Schol.; Ovid, *Met.*, IV, 617ff.; Schol. Pindar, *Pyth.*, X, 47.

² Apollod., II, 4.3; Strabo, I, 2.35.

³ See Lloyd, "Perseus and Chemmis (Herod., II, 91)", *JHS*, LXXXIX, 1969, 76-86, who opposes the earlier identification of Perseus and Min.

⁴ See above ch. 11.4.

⁵ Cf. also Kirk, *Myth*, p. 184.

⁶ As Min-Harsiesis he was shown in the form of Osiris: Bonnet, *Realexikon*, p. 465.

⁷ Cf. Tacitus, *Hist.*, IV, 81ff.

⁸ Manetho, ed. Waddell (Loeb), p. 193ff. and note.

⁹ Frgs. 82, 83; see also above p. 66 n. 2.

to Sarapis, the popularity of whom fluctuated in different periods and places. Apparently an artificial creation on the part of Ptolemy I, Sarapis seems to have been intended to be the patron deity of the Greeks in Egypt. His appeal in Ptolemaic Egypt was restricted: he was worshipped more in the IIIrd century B.C. than at any other time, except perhaps in the Severan period, and then largely in Alexandria by Greeks and Hellenized Egyptians. The native Egyptians continued to worship Osor-Hapi, and were not attracted to the worship of Sarapis until the following century, when his cult became more popular in the Fayûm. It is possible that the decline of Greek interest in the god came as a result of the deflection of royal interest from this virtually Greek god to the native Egyptian cults. However that may be, the cult of Sarapis gained little ground either inside or outside Egypt until the Roman period.¹

25.3 It is typical of primitive cultures to seek divine aid or inspiration through dreams provoked either naturally, by fasting, isolation and prayer, or artificially, for example by drugs. And in the medico-religious practices of both Egypt and Greece, incubation played an important part. The patient spent one or more nights in the temple-precinct in the hope of experiencing and remembering his dreams. These, interpreted by the priest or doctor the following day, might contain the secret of the patient's cure, or the god himself might have appeared in person to the sick man, curing him, however temporarily. The London-Leiden Papyrus² shows that isolation, silence and lamps were used to make the patient receptive, and the possibility cannot be ruled out that some were cured by auto-suggestion in a state of semi-hypnosis or self-induced trance.³

The temples most renowned for their cures in Egypt were the one at Dendera, the temple of Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahari, and the Serapea of Memphis and Canopus. At Dendera, water was sanctified

¹ See Fraser, "Two Studies on the Cult of Sarapis in the Hellenistic World", *Opuscula Atheniensia*, III, 1960 1-54; and "Current Problems Concerning the Early History of the Cult of Sarapis", *Op. Ath.*, VII, 1967, 23-45.

² Griffith and Thompson, *Demotic Magical Papyrus of London and Leiden*, p. 45 (col. V, 3-8).

³ Cf. modern faith-healing for example.

by contact with sacred inscriptions and was then used to heal the sick. The building itself seems to have been a kind of retiring house where the sick were prepared for their therapeutic dream. Deir el-Bahari shows traces of therapeutic use, and the graffiti of invalids still remain.¹ In the Ptolemaic period the upper terrace was consecrated to Imhotep and Amenhotpe son of Hapu, deified wise men. Clearly these were places of pilgrimage and incubation.

It is uncertain whether the Egyptians influenced the Greeks on the subject of incubation, or the Greeks the Egyptians. In the view of Ghalioungui, *Magic and Medical Science in Ancient Egypt*, p. 41ff., the latter is the case. He points out that the temple at Dendera is Ptolemaic, and although that at Deir el-Bahari is older, its therapeutic side is possibly not. In addition the London-Leiden Papyrus dates from the early IIIrd century A.D. Therefore all the evidence of temple-healing is late, and the practice may have originated with, rather than inspired, the Greeks.

On the other hand, Saunders, *The Transitions from Ancient Egyptian to Greek Medicine*, p. 5 and p. 11f. suggests that the practice of incubation had its origin in Egypt, and that the elaborate development of this in the cult of Asklepios came from Egyptian sources through the close association of the two races at Naucratis in the VIth and Vth centuries B.C., and the identification of Asklepios with Imhotep. The cult spread throughout Greece at the end of the Vth century B.C., and it is possible that it, together with its practice of incubation, was fostered by a general failure to control the several epidemics of plague.² But although temple incubation seems to have been common from at least the time of Amenhotpe II and Thutmose IV (1450-1425 and 1425-1417 B.C.), there is little evidence of its therapeutic use then.³ It must, however, be agreed

¹ See Grafton-Milne, "The Sanatorium of Dêr el-Bahri", *JEA*, I, 1914, 96-98. Many inscriptions of the IInd century A.D. still survive, while there is a stele belonging to the middle of the IInd century B.C. See also Bataille, *Les Inscriptions grecques du Temple de Hatshepsout à Deir el-Bahari*. For an inscription in the Serapeum of Memphis, see Lauer and Picard, *Les statues ptolémaïques du Serapieion de Memphis*, p. 177-179.

² Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational*, p. 110-116, 193.

³ Gadd, *Ideas of Divine Rule*, p. 26. It is clear from this that incubation was used not only, and perhaps not even primarily for medical purposes: it might be employed as a means of learning the unknown in past, present or

that the practice is more likely to have passed from Egypt to Greece than *vice versa*. It is difficult to conceive that the Greeks should have influenced radically the medico-religious beliefs of a race which prided itself on its inherited traditions, even during the Ptolemaic era.

25.6 The ἀθανασίας φάρμακον may be a reference to the drug 'nh-imy.¹ It occurs in the medical texts, where its use is given as a medicine, ointment or poultice, and it was also employed in embalming. Jéquier, "Matériaux pour servir à l'établissement d'un dictionnaire d'archéologie égyptienne", *BIFAO*, XIX, 1922, 136, suggests that the name means "flower of the tree 'am'", but it is more probably to be translated "(there is) life in it."

25.6 Here Horus is apparently confused with his father, Osiris, who was murdered by Seth.² However, ch. CXIII of the "Book of the Dead" refers to the legend of the drowning of Horus and the recovery of his body (apparently in fragments) by the crocodile-god Sobek. There may also be some confusion here between Osiris and Dionysus Zagreus, son of Zeus and Demeter, who was killed by the Titans and restored by Demeter.³

P. Oxyrhynchus, 1380, 246ff. records that Isis made Horus immortal and appointed him the successor of his father. And P. Ebers, I, 12ff., a spell for releasing (or undoing) any bandage, reads, "Releasing twice by Isis. Horus was released by Isis from the evil done against him by his brother Seth, when he slew his father Osiris. O Isis, great in magic, release me!" In general Isis appears as the protector of her son whom she aids with magic.⁴

25.7 The evidence for Horus as a healer has been collected by Spiegelberg, "Horus als Arzt", *ZÄS*, LVII, 1922, 70-71. According

future, or simply as a means of communing with the god. Cf. also Dodds, *op. cit.*, p. 110f.

¹ *Wb*, I, 203, 6-9; *Wb. Drog.*, p. 98.

² See above p. 60.

³ Cf. Diodorus, III, 62.6. Festugière, "Les Mystères de Dionysos", *Rev. Bibl.*, XLIV, 1935, 378ff., says the myth had its origin in Egypt, and was influenced by the Osiris myth. But see also above ch. 22.7.

⁴ For bibliography see Griffiths, *The Conflict of Horus and Seth*, p. 46, n. 5.

to P. Turin, 124, 5, Horus was at an early date chief physician in the house of Rē'. P. Turin, 134,6-135, 6¹ contains a passage which identifies Horus with the magician, the healer of Seth, with whom the victim of the spell is identified. On the other hand, in medical texts the diseased person is commonly identified with Horus, and considered to be suffering as if from the evil-doing of Seth.

CHAPTER 26

26.3f. For this extraordinary explanation of Egyptian chronology, see above p. 13. For a discussion of the Egyptian calendar see below ch. 50.2.

26.5 That ὥρος is a word for "year" is stated also by Plutarch,² who implies that it was an obsolete expression, and by Athenaeus.³ The term ὠρογράφῃαι appears to be used only by Diodorus, but Plutarch⁴ mentions the ὠρογράφοι or chroniclers of Naxos. ὥροι in the plural, is also used for "annals."⁵

26.6 The Giants of Greek mythology were represented as creatures with huge bodies, not as πολυσωμάτων. Griffiths, *The Conflict of Horus and Seth*, p. 102f., notes that Gunn suggested that what Diodorus had in mind was the representation of a king smiting a closely packed group of enemies (as, for example, that on the pylon of the Edfu temple). Griffiths, however, suggests that since Seth and his followers were occasionally called Giants by the classical authors, and it was well known that they were capable of transforming themselves into various animals, Diodorus may be referring to reliefs where the Sethian enemies of Horus and Osiris are depicted as animals under attack.

It is unnecessary to suppose, with Vogel, that a noun has dropped

¹ Gardiner, *Admonitions of an Egyptian Sage*, 52, and Griffiths, *Conflict*, p. 51.

² *Mor.*, 677e: Ἀντίπατρος δ' ὁ ἑταῖρος ἔφη τοὺς μὲν ἐνιαυτοὺς ἀρχαῖκῶς ὥρους λέγεσθαι . . .

³ X, 423e: οἱ ἐνιαυτοὶ ὥροι λέγονται . . .

⁴ *Mor.*, 869b.

⁵ The feminine noun ὥρα (see *LS*), whose basic meaning is any period fixed by natural laws and revolutions, may also refer to the year generally.

out here: *ὀνομαζομένους γίγαντας* may well be balanced by *διακοσμομένους τερατωδῶς*, the emphasis being that whereas the Greeks call the creatures Giants, the Egyptians represent them as monsters.

CHAPTER 27

27.1 Contrary to popular belief, consanguineous marriage was not particularly common in Egypt. During the pharaonic period, marriage between brothers and sisters appears to have occurred almost exclusively within royal families, and was presumably undertaken for dynastic reasons. The evidence for such marriages outside the royal family during this period has been collected by Cerný, "Consanguineous Marriages in Pharaonic Egypt", *JEA*, XL, 1954, 23-29, who concludes that it was possible but not common. In the few attested cases, moreover, marriage can only be proved between half brother and half sister: there is no certain instance of marriage between a full brother and sister. This did occur, however, in royal families, and Gardiner cites the case of the parents of King Ahmose of the XVIIIth Dyn., who were the children of the same mother and father.¹

For the Graeco-Roman period there is definite evidence in the papyri of non-royal consanguineous marriages.² In fact consanguineous marriage seems to have been yet more common in the Roman than in the Ptolemaic period, and extended to other relationships than that of full brother and sister.³ If one can judge from the lack of evidence for the dynastic period, the practice was presumably not inherited from pharaonic Egypt, but became established in the Graeco-Roman period, possibly in imitation of the consanguineous marriages of the Ptolemies. Kornemann, *Klio*, XIX, 1925, 355-361, suggests that the Ptolemies were themselves following the Persian

¹ *Egypt of the Pharaohs*, p. 172f. See also Winlock, "Tombs of the Kings of the XVIIIth Dynasty at Thebes", *JEA*, X, 1924, 217-277.

² See Thierfelder, *Die Geschwisterehe im hellenistisch-römischen Ägypten*; Bell, "Brother and Sister Marriage in Graeco-Roman Egypt", *RIDA*, II, i, 1949, 83-92; Seidl, *Ägyptische Rechtsgeschichte der Saiten- und Perserzeit* (1968), p. 76ff.

³ Thus there is a record of a possible marriage of father and daughter: see Young, "A Possible Consanguineous Marriage in the time of Philip Arrhidaeus", *JARCE*, IV, 1965, 69-71.

practice rather than the Egyptian, but this seems in itself unlikely. Certainly the Greeks regarded it as an Egyptian custom, and appear to have been to some extent shocked by it, at least at first.¹

27.2 Apart from the few female pharaohs,² queens in Egypt were definitely subordinate to the king. Although the king might have more than one wife, the "Great Wife" stood first in importance after him, and as a rule her children were the only heirs to the throne. The king's mother, although highly honoured, occupied what was definitely a secondary position, indicating that there was no matriarchy in Egypt.³ There do, however, appear to be instances of matrilineal law, or at least the remains of it, in Egypt: in one nome inheritance was through the women; Old Kingdom kings are often portrayed with their mothers;⁴ and in the Middle Kingdom a man was described as the son of his mother.⁵ But inheritance of status and profession came from the father. And in the sight of the law men and women were equal, so that daughters could inherit with their brothers.⁶ In this respect the status of women in Egypt differed widely from that in other ancient societies, notably Greece.

27.2 The so-called marriage contracts are in fact usually no more than documents dealing with the property rights of parents and children, and with financial matters. Most of them date from the Ptolemaic period and later. But it is generally accepted now that marriages were valid without documents, especially as a large proportion of those found were drawn up only after the birth of children.⁷

Virtually nothing is known of any ceremonies attached to mar-

¹ Cf. Pausanias, I, 7.1: Οὗτος ὁ Πτολεμαῖος Ἀρσινόης ἀδελφῆς ἀμφοτέρωθεν ἐρασθεὶς ἐγγημεν αὐτήν, Μακεδόσιν οὐδαμῶς ποιῶν νομιζόμενα, Αἰγυπτίοις μέντοι ὦν ἦρχε.

² See below ch. 44.4.

³ This point is discussed by Redford, *History and Chronology of the Eighteenth Dynasty of Egypt: Seven Studies*, p. 65f., 71f.

⁴ Stevenson Smith, *The Old Kingdom in Egypt, CAH*³, Vol. I, ch. 14, 9-11.

⁵ Černý, *JEA*, XL, 1954, 24 and 27.

⁶ Cf. Gardiner, *Egypt of the Pharaohs*, p. 269f.; Théodoridès, *Bull. soc. fr. d'Égyptologie*, XLVII, 1966, 11. See also Pirenne, "Le statut de la femme dans l'ancienne Égypte", *Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin*, Vol. XI, p. 63-77.

⁷ Edgerton, *Notes on Egyptian Marriage*.

riage, but in the First Tale of Setna Khaemwese¹ a description is given of what was obviously considered to be a legal marriage: the bride is publicly conducted to the bridegroom's house accompanied by gifts (but whether or not this dowry was essential is unknown), and the bridegroom holds a feast to which the guests bring gifts. This story actually dates from the Ptolemaic period, but purports to belong to the remote past. The most important factor appears to be public recognition that the couple concerned considered themselves to be married.

Originally the marriage agreement seems to have been made between the husband and the bride's father,² the man paying the father a certain sum to sever the ties between his wife and her parents. After the XXVIth Dyn., the man and woman concerned made the agreement themselves. Soon the money was paid to the wife instead of her father, and at a still later date the sum was diminished until finally it was settled on the wife only in the case of divorce. After 517 B.C., two types of marriage are found: in the first the husband makes a gift to the wife as before; in the second, the wife makes a gift to her husband. But there existed no requisite in form for marriage, and the outward sign of marriage was simply cohabitation.

In Ptolemaic times, and presumably earlier, marriage between Egyptian nationals was based on just such an unwritten agreement, and the written documents on maintenance were property settlements made by those already married. The Egyptian form of marriage appears to have been adopted by the Greeks, who settled financial questions in a συγγραφὴ ὁμολογίας, which originally dealt only with dowries. But the Greeks could also conclude marriage by a συγγραφὴ συνοικεσίου, the characteristic feature of which seems to have been the giving away of bride to groom, and this was eventually adopted by Egyptians. And in fact Greeks married according to Egyptian custom would follow it with a συγγραφὴ συνοικεσίου and ἔκδοσις to make the marriage valid in the eyes of both Greek and Egyptian law.³

¹ Griffith, *Stories of the High Priests of Memphis*.

² Pestman, *Marriage and Matrimonial Property*, p. 11f.

³ Taubenschlag, *The Law of Greco-Roman Egypt in the Light of the Papyri*, p. 113f.

No rules concerning the rights and obligations of spouses are found in Egyptian settlements, although they could apparently be written in at will. But Greek contracts tend to outline the duties of both partners. If the husband violated his duties he had to return the dowry together with 100% (in the oldest contracts) or later 50%. If the wife violated hers, she forfeited her dowry.¹

Divorce was apparently by consent, with either side taking the initiative, in both Egyptian and Greek law. The earlier Egyptian documents provide for the payment to the wife of a fine if her husband divorced her. In Greek contracts the husband was obliged to refund the dowry. But a wife who abandoned her husband did not forfeit her dowry, nor was she fined.²

In Egyptian law, men and women had equal rights in marriage, and even in Greek law where the very form of marriage implied a certain submission on the part of the wife, she nevertheless retained definite legal rights. This was true also of the general legal position of women: originally Egyptian women held an equal position in law with men. But under Greek influence that was diminished, because Greek women needed a guardian to act for them in many situations concerned with the law.

27.4 This inscription of Isis recorded by Diodorus corresponds almost exactly with the beginning of the Isiac hymns found at Cyme and Ios. The hymn from Cyme begins: (1) Εἷσις ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ τύραννος πάσης χώρας καὶ ἐπαιδεύθην ὑπ[ὸ] Ἑρμοῦ καὶ γράμματα εὖρον μετὰ Ἑρμοῦ, τὰ τε ἱερὰ καὶ τὰ δημόσια γράμματα, ἵνα μὴ ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς πάντα γράφηται—(2) Ἐγὼ νόμους ἀνθρώποις ἐθέμην καὶ ἐνομοθέτησα ἃ οὐθελς δύναται μεταθεῖναι. (3) Ἐγὼ εἰμι Κρόνου θυγάτηρ πρεσβυτάτη<ι>—(4) Ἐγὼ εἰμι γ[υ]νὴ καὶ ἀδελφὴ Ὀσερίδος βασιλέως—(5) Ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ κάρπον ἀνθρώποις εὐροῦσα—(6) Ἐγὼ εἰμι μήτηρ Ὠρου βασιλέως. (7) Ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ἐν τῷ τοῦ Κυνὸς ἄστρῳ ἐπιτέλλουσα—(8) Ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ παρὰ γυναιξὶ θεὸς καλουμένη. (9) Ἐμοὶ Βούβαστος πόλις ὠκοδομήθη³—... (53) ... Χαῖρε Αἴγυπτε θρέψασά με.⁴

¹ Taubenschlag, *op. cit.*, p. 120f.

² Taubenschlag, *op. cit.*, p. 121ff.

³ From this it would appear that Isis and Bastet (the cat-goddess of Bubastis, see below ch. 87.4) were fused. Cf. Plutarch, *DIO*, 63, and see Bergman, *Ich bin Isis*, p. 39f. and p. 40, n. 1.

⁴ Salaç, "Inscriptions de Kymé, d'Éolide, de Phocée, de Tralles et de quel-

And the opening of the hymn from Ios is virtually identical.¹

The dating of the hymns is still not entirely clear. The Ios hymn is dated to the IIInd or IIIrd centuries A.D., while the Cyme hymn was originally attributed to the IIInd century B.C.² But it now seems probable that the latter belongs to a period no earlier than the Ist or IIInd centuries A.D.³ On the other hand, the Andros hymn, which differs from those of Ios and Cyme in being in verse form, can be dated to the Ist century B.C.⁴ In other words the poetic version forms our earliest recorded text, and is almost contemporary with the more formalized prose version, first recorded in part by Diodorus. Obviously Diodorus cannot himself be the author of the prose version: the very fact that he claims to give only part of the inscriptions, the rest having been eroded by time, suggests that he was fully aware of the existence of at least one much longer hymn to Isis from which he quotes only the opening lines. This original hymn from which the texts given by Diodorus and the Cyme hymn are copied cannot be later than the Ist century B.C., and may be considerably earlier.

In fact, Diodorus gives the origin of his text as a grave-stele at Nysa in Arabia, where Isis and Osiris are said to be buried. But in ch. 22.2 he cites an alternative tradition, according to which Isis was buried at Memphis, where her shrine in the temple-area of Hephaestus was famous in his day. This is significant in view of the introduction to the Cyme hymn which reads: Δημήτριος Ἀρτεμιδῶ-ques autres villes d'Asie Mineure", *Bull. Corr. Hell.*, LI, 1927, 3, 378-383. Of the text in Diodorus, Salaç says "Il paraît vraisemblable que l'auteur suivi par Diodore a transcrit le contenu d'une stèle analogue à la nôtre qu'il a localisée dans une terre lointaine et qualifiée de stèle hiéroglyphique. Et s'il s'est abstenu d'en reproduire toute la teneur, ce n'est ni la vétusté de l'inscription ni sa propre paresse qui l'en ont détourné: en fait il n'a gardé que ce qui s'accordait avec ses tendances euhéméristes et avec l'hypothèse que la stèle surmontait un tombeau." Bergman, *Ich bin Isis*, p. 32f. suggests further that the omission by Diodorus of the line Ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ παρὰ γυναιξὶ θεὸς καλουμένη, accords well with his general euhemeristic attitude, in suggesting that Isis and Osiris are the mortal children of the most recently deified god.

¹ *Inscr. Gr.*, XII, 5, no. 14.

² *Bull. Corr. Hell.*, XLIX, 1925, 477f.

³ See Müller, *Ägypten und die griechischen Isis-Aretalogien*, p. 11f. for a list of the known hymns and their dates.

⁴ See also Peek, *Der Isishymnus von Andros*.

ρου ὁ καὶ θρασέας Μάγνη[ς] ἀπὸ Μαιάνδρου Ἰσιδι εὐχὴν τάδε ἐγράφη<ι> ἐκ τῆς στήλης τῆς ἐν Μέμφει, ἥτις ἔστηκεν πρὸς τῷ Ἡφαιστιῷ indicating that this was copied from an original in the Temple of Ptah at Memphis. And indeed the Egyptian foundation for the Isis hymns has been warmly supported in recent years by both Müller, *Ägypten und die griechischen Isis-Aretalogien*, and Bergman, *Ich bin Isis*. In Müller's view the hymns are predominantly Greek in thought, but contain obvious Egyptian elements, such a combination of Greek and Egyptian ideas being perfectly possible in the Hellenistic period. Since he believes the thought to be basically Greek, Müller suggests that the most probable explanation is that the hymn was composed by a Greek priest of Isis, who through an Egyptian interpreter or through his own knowledge of the language, had access to Egyptian texts from which he incorporated occasional elements.¹ Bergman would go yet further: he believes the background of the Aretalogies to be thoroughly Egyptian, and he compares them with texts from Abydos and Edfu. And although he tends occasionally to exaggerate the similarities, in the main his theories are attractive.

In this context it is perhaps worth considering the view expressed by Nock² on P. Oxyrhynchus, 1380: this contains a list of the cult names of Isis together with the places at which they were used. This in turn is followed by a description of the benefits conferred upon mankind by Isis, resembling Diodorus' stele. Of the latter Nock says that it represents an accommodation of the Egyptian style to Greek ideas, and he suspects the influence of Ptolemy, Timotheus and Manetho on the Isiac mysteries.

27.5 There is no immediate parallel for the stele of Osiris, unlike that of Isis, and thus there is no proof that this was not an isolated invention on the part of Diodorus' source. As for its date, all that can be said is that the reference to India makes it certain that it post-dates Alexander the Great. Stylistically it differs from the Isis-stele in being looser in construction. But it is analysed by Bergman³ who shows it to be a combination of two themes: Osiris as the son of Cronus, and Osiris as the εὐρετής and εὐεργέτης of the entire world.

¹ *op. cit.*, p. 88.

² *Conversion*, ch. IX, p. 150-152.

³ *Ich bin Isis* p. 27-43; *Isis-Seele* p. 73-98.

Cronus is usually identified with the Egyptian god Geb, commonly believed to be the father of Osiris. Spiegelberg, in a communication in *ZÄS*, XLIX, 1911, 129, notes that Lepsius, *Chronologie*, 93, sees νεώτατος τῶν θεῶν as a translation of a common epithet of Geb, *rp'ty ntrw* "heir of the gods." But Spiegelberg suggests that it is rather a mistranslation: in demotic *rp'ty* becomes virtually indistinguishable from *rpi* "to be young", and it must be the latter which the Greeks inadvertently took to be the title of Geb, and translated accordingly as νεώτατος.¹ Such cases of false etymology are not uncommon in the later period of Egyptian history.²

In Egyptian literature, Geb is occasionally portrayed as a gander, called the "Great Cackler", whose female laid the cosmic egg. Anthes, "Affinity and Difference between Egyptian and Greek Sculpture", *Proc. of the Amer. Philos. Soc.*, 107, no. 1, 1963, in fact suggests that the concept of the primeval egg originated in Egypt, was adopted by the Phoenicians, and was thence taken to Greece by the Orphics.³ In Egypt the king was often described as "powerful in the egg" or "ruling in the egg",⁴ and such passages as, for example, this from P. Anastasi, II, 2, 7,⁵ are quite common: "King (while yet in) the egg (i.e. in his mother's womb) even as the majesty of Horus, who has seized for himself the lands through his victories." This, said in praise of Ramesses II as a warrior, is not so far in concept from the Osiris-stele.

CHAPTER 28

A large part of chapters 28 and 29 is reported by Diodorus as the opinion of the Egyptians themselves, rather than of the Greeks. It is hardly surprising then that the Egyptians are credited with such widespread colonization, at least in theory. At the same time, the

¹ See also Bergman, *op. cit.*, p. 31f.

² See e.g. above ch. 11.

³ The Orphics believed in a cosmic egg from which sprang the first principle of life, Phanes (see above ch. 11.3), who then organised the subsequent cosmic development; see Guthrie, *Orpheus and Greek Religion*, p. 92ff.; Kirk and Raven, *The Presocratic Philosophers*, p. 39-48; Morenz, *Ägypten und die alt-orphische Kosmogonie*.

⁴ Moret, *Du caractère religieux de la royauté pharaonique*, p. 66, n. 2.

⁵ Caminos, *Late-Egyptian Miscellanies*, p. 40.

Greeks appear to have been impressed by their first real contact with the ancient civilization of Egypt around the middle of the VIIth century B.C., and Egypt came to play an increasing part in Greek mythology.¹ But whereas it was natural for a Greek colony in a foreign land to attempt to establish a firm connection with the strangers by claiming that the colony had been founded by some indigenous hero, the Greeks would be unlikely to invent at a later date a barbarian founder for their own famous cities in Greece unless tradition actually suggested that such was the case. The earliest traditions connect Argos with Egypt, Thebes with Phoenicia, Corinth with Colchis, and so on: presumably then there was some element of truth in these traditions. Paradoxically, the connection between Athens and Egypt was not suggested until much later, and appears to have no historical foundation.² In fact the early ancestors of the Greeks came from the north, but this was gradually forgotten; legends retained only the vaguest memory of a foreign origin, placing it in the east.³

28.1 Meyer, *Forschungen zur alten Geschichte*, I, p. 67-104, recognizes that Belus is derived from Ba'al, "the god of the Aramaean merchants in Egypt."⁴ Ba'al was identified by the Hyksos with the Egyptian god Seth, and was worshipped by them above all other Egyptian gods. It is possible that the legend that Belus led a colony to Babylon represents the return of the Semitic Hyksos to their home, which, however, was not Babylon, but Syria-Palestine.

28.2 The connection of both Danaus and Argos with Egypt is traditional. According to the myth, Io, daughter of Argos, first king of the city of that name, was turned into a cow, and, bearing the child of Zeus, was driven from country to country until she reached Egypt. Here she gave birth to Epaphus, who became king of Egypt

¹ The Greek contempt for barbarians appears not to have developed to any extent before the second half of the Vth century B.C.

² See further below ch. 28.4.

³ For the early history and migrations of the Greeks see *CAH*².

⁴ Belus, or Ba'al, however, seems usually to have been interpreted either as a divine title, or more commonly as the name of an oriental king. In Herodotus, I, 7.3 he appears as the ancestor of the founder of the Heraclidae in Lydia, and elsewhere (Apollod., II, 1.4) he is said to be the father of Danaus.

and was the ancestor of the brothers Danaus and Aegyptus.

According to the earliest versions of the story, the subsequent struggle for power between the two brothers took place on Egyptian soil, and only after the murder of Aegyptus did Danaus and his daughters flee to Argos, where he obtained the throne. This appears to have been the version followed by Aeschylus, *Supplikes*; but since his play was to deal with the invasion of a barbarian army into Greece (it was performed soon after Xerxes' invasion of Greece) the murder of the sons of Aegyptus had to be set in that country. According to Schol. Euripides, *Hecuba*, V, 886, Danaus never left Argos: he expelled Aegyptus and his sons from there, but these later returned to invade Argos and there met their death.

Danaus as the eponymous ancestor of the Danaoi, a term which in Homer apparently means simply "Greek", was endowed by Aeschylus with an entirely Greek pedigree. It is uncertain exactly how far the tale of Io and Danaus' relation to her was invented or invoked to achieve this end. But in spite of such attempts to emphasize the Greek origins of the Argive dynasty, it is obvious that Danaus was considered to be a foreigner: he is commonly linked with Cadmus from Phoenicia and Pelops from Asia Minor.

The problem of the origin and significance of Danaus is summarized by Stubbings, *CAH*², II, ch. XIV. It was long thought that Danaus had some connection with the Hyksos rulers of Egypt, and with the discovery of the shaft graves at Mycenae this theory has been given a certain amount of substance. These graves, dating from the early XVIth century B.C., demonstrate the fusion of Minoan and Helladic characteristics. They were found to contain both Egyptian imports and possible examples of Egyptian influence.¹ There are two feasible explanations. One is that Greek mercenaries served in Egypt against the Hyksos, and that Crete, suffering from the effects of an earthquake, was unable to interfere. But it is unlikely that the Middle Helladic people were sufficiently organized to be useful allies against the Hyksos. The second theory is that

¹ The carved grave stelae have no precedents in Greece, though they are common in Egypt. The reliefs show the earliest evidence for the horse-drawn chariot in Greece, and it is possible that this was introduced from Egypt, where it first appears under the Hyksos rulers. But Syria or Asia Minor are other equally possible places of origin.

Mycenae may perhaps have come under the domination of new leaders or conquerors. Invaders of Greece are generally described vaguely as coming from the north; but at this date Greece's foreign connections were with Crete and the Eastern Mediterranean, and there is virtually no evidence of northern connections. That there was some conquest by invaders from Egypt and the Levant has the support of later Greek tradition: by Classical times it was common knowledge that Danaus arrived in the Argolid from Egypt.

The *Marmor Parium*¹ records the arrival from Egypt of the daughters of Danaus during the reign of Erichthonius, 1511/10 and 1510/9 B.C. If Danaus or another invader did arrive in Greece from Egypt around this time, the most likely incident in Egyptian history with which to equate it is the expulsion of the Hyksos rulers by Ahhotpe's son Ahmose.² This, however, took place some sixty-five years before the date given by the *Marmor Parium* for the arrival of Danaus in Greece.³ Nevertheless, to postulate the arrival in the Argolid of some of the displaced Hyksos rulers from Egypt in the early XVIth century B.C. would account for the Egyptian influence apparent in the Mycenaean shaft-graves.

The genealogical affiliation between Danaus and Cadmus⁴ indicates that the Greeks believed there was some connection between their movements. It is possible that the advances of the Middle Minoan III culture and the rise of Mycenaean civilization were both part of one large westward movement, and that this movement had earlier produced the Hyksos domination of Egypt. None of this, however, can be proved historically, but as a theory it accounts for

¹ Jacoby, *Marmor Parium*, p. 5, v. 9 and p. 139.

² Berard, "Les Hyksos et la légende d'Io", *Syria*, XXIX, 1950, 1-43.

³ The issue is only further confused by the statement to be found in the versions of Manetho's XVIIIth Dyn., that Danaus was Armais or Harmais, and Aegyptus his brother Ramesses or Sethos. If, as seems probable, Harmais is to be identified with Haremhab (see below ch. 64, 13), the last king of the XVIIIth Dyn., and in effect the founder of the XIXth, this would give Danaus a date of c. 1335-1308 B.C., approximately two and a half centuries after the expulsion of the Hyksos, and two centuries after the traditional date for Danaus. Meyer, *Ägyptische Chronologie*, p. 75 suggests that the identification is due not to Manetho, but to a Jewish commentator or interpolator.

⁴ See above ch. 23. According to later genealogies they were cousins.

many of the archaeological facts of the beginnings of Mycenaean civilization.

28.3 There is indisputable evidence that circumcision was practised in Egypt, but it is insufficient to determine how widespread the practice was. The evidence of Egyptian texts and reliefs is collected by Jonckheere, "La circoncision des anciens égyptiens", *Centaureus*, I, 3, 1951, 212-234.¹ There are only seven passages in the whole of Egyptian literature relating to circumcision, but representations of the god Min and the drawing of the hieroglyph of the male organ suggest that it was common. The age at which the operation was performed seems to have varied: on a relief from a VIth Dyn. mastaba at Saqqâra those being operated on are shown as youths, while on a later bas-relief from Karnak they are young boys. In general boys do not seem to have been circumcised until puberty, and it may not have been obligatory even then. There is no evidence that it was a ritual act as it was among the Hebrews, although on the Saqqâra relief it is a priest who performs the operation.

28.4 The suggestion that there existed a close tie between Athens and Egypt does not appear until a fairly late date. It is therefore improbable that the city was, as Diodorus and others suggest, a foreign foundation. But it must also be admitted that the Athenians did recognize some connection with Egypt. Plato, *Timaëus*, 21Ef. is the earliest author to propose such a connection, but he attributes its recognition to the Egyptians themselves rather than to the Athenians. But this is undoubtedly the foundation on which further elaboration of the relationship was based. Originally Neith, the ancient goddess of the city of Sais, who became particularly popular after the XXVIth Dyn., was identified by the Greeks with Athene,² creating a theoretical link between Athens and Sais. It was from Sais, in the Vth L.E. nome that the Classical authors believed Athens to have been founded.

¹ See also Lefèvre, *Essai sur la médecine égyptienne de l'époque pharaonique*, p. 173ff.; Pillet, in *ASAE*, LII, 1952, 94-104; Jonckheere, *Autour de l'autopsie d'une momie*; Ghalioungui, *Magic and Medical Science in Ancient Egypt*, p. 95f.; Sigerist, *History of Medicine*, I, p. 243f.

² See above ch. 12.7.

The proof of this colonization apparently offered by the Egyptians is tenuous, and the existence of a city of the name of Astu in Egypt is doubtful. It is possible that there was some confusion between this Greek word and the Egyptian *ist*, "place, seat", which gave rise to such a theory; although this must be suspect, since by Classical times the final *t* of the Egyptian word would have been lost in vocalization. There was a town called *ist* in the IIInd L.E. nome,¹ but the same objection applies here, and the name was probably pronounced *ēse*. However, the temple of Ptah at Thebes was called *isty*,² and since the final *y* would have protected the vocalization of the *t*, this may have resembled Astu in sound.

28.5 The division of the population into three classes at Athens is traditionally given an early date. According to Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.*, XIII, 2, the classes were well established by c. 580 B.C. when representatives from them were chosen to rule as successors of the tyrant Damasias; while Plutarch, *Theseus*, 25, attributes the original division to this hero.³ Plato, *Laws*, 737e specifies that the γεωμῆτορες must be able to defend the land. It can be seen that this class division is entirely Greek, or rather Athenian, and bears little relation to the slightly more accurate account of the Egyptian social structure given in chapters 73 and 74.

28.6 Diodorus' Petes is the Peteus of the Iliad,⁴ father of the Greek leader Menestheus. The name may well be of Egyptian origin, since Ranke, *Die Ägyptischen Personennamen*, I, 121, 17, records the Greek form Petes for the Egyptian *p3-di* (XXIIInd Dyn.).⁵

Most editors accept that there is a break in the text at this point, on the grounds that what follows appears to refer to Cecrops. Cecrops was traditionally the first king, and was half man, half serpent, the latter characteristic indicating that he was autochthonous.⁶ He was originally regarded by the Greeks as a sort of Adam

¹ Gauthier, *Dictionnaire Géographique*, I, 104.

² Gauthier, *op. cit.*, I, 106.

³ The classes according to Aristotle were εὐπατρίδαι, ἀγροῖκοι and δημοῦργοι; according to Plutarch, εὐπατρίδαι, γεωμῆτορες and δημοῦργοι.

⁴ II, 552; IV, 327, 338; XIII, 690.

⁵ Cf. also Ranke, I, 126, 6: *p3-di-sw*.

⁶ Mähly, *Die Schlange in Mythos und Kultus der klassischen Völker*.

with no mortal predecessors, rather than as a subject of legend. He has no immediate connection with Egypt, but as Eitrem, in *RE*, XI, 118, points out, "Als es Mode geworden war, ägyptische Einflüsse in den alten griechischen Kulturzentren zu wittern (zuerst Plat. Tim., 21 E), hielt man auch den Kekrops für einen eingewanderten Ägypter. Er stamme aus Sais, wo die Göttin Neith für gleichbedeutend mit der griechischen Athene galt."

The term διφύης is explained by Diodorus as indicating that the man was a citizen of two states, Greek and barbarian, and was therefore part ἀνθρώπου, part θηρίου (but not specifically snake). Elsewhere¹ Cecrops' epithet διφύης is explained as meaning δῶ φωνᾶς ἦν ἡσκημένος, while Suidas maintains that Cecrops was part male, part female.²

But Cecrops was not the only legendary king of Athens to be described as half man, half snake. The same was said of Erichthonius, often confused with, and possibly originally identical with Erechtheus. This Attic hero, who later became king of Athens, was as a child placed in a chest by Athene and entrusted to the daughter(s) of Cecrops.³ These disobediently opened the chest and were frightened by the child who was wholly or partly a serpent, or had serpents with him. It is doubtful, therefore, whether it is necessary to assume a break in the text here. Diodorus says nothing to indicate that he is talking of the first king of Athens rather than of one of his successors with a similar characteristic. And his very explanation of the term διφύης makes it as applicable to what he tells us of Petes as to Cecrops. The doubt lies in whether or not Petes, or Peteus, was ever described as διφύης or as coming to Athens from Egypt, and of this we have no evidence other than that of Diodorus. Unless such evidence is forthcoming the problem of the possible existence of a break in the text must remain unsolved.

CHAPTER 29

29.1 According to Greek legend, Erechtheus was born from the earth like Cecrops and Erichthonius, and his name appears to mean

¹ Eusebius, II, 24; Sch. Nonn. in Greg. Naz., 374, 30ff.

² Guthrie, *In the Beginning*, p. 23. See also below ch. 29.1.

³ Eurip., *Ion*, 21ff., 270ff.; Apollod., III, 189; Hyg., *Fab.*, 166, 4-5.

"earthborn." In origin he was probably a local form of Poseidon, with whom he was certainly connected in some way. The traditional struggle for the Acropolis took place between Athene and Poseidon Erechtheus, and the latter was forced to give way to the goddess. It appears to have been only at a later date that Erechtheus came to be regarded as one of the early kings. Even after his defeat by Athene he was permitted to remain on the Acropolis in the form of a snake.

The main legendary exploit of Erechtheus was the war against the Eleusinians and their ally Eumolpus, represented as a Thracian. Erechtheus was victorious and killed Eumolpus. This war is not mentioned by the *Marmor Parium*, which offers instead a peaceful version, according to which, under the rule of Erechtheus, Eumolpus established the mysteries in Eleusis, Demeter appeared in Attica and Triptolemus planted crops.¹ Much of this appears reflected in Diodorus' account.

The suggestion that Erechtheus was an Egyptian is also to be found in *Schol. Aristides*, XIII, 95 (ed. Dindorf, III, p. 17f.): δεῖ δὲ γινῶναι ὅτι ὁ Χάραξ ἱστορεῖ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἀποίκους εἶναι τῶν Σαϊτῶν· ἔστι δὲ Σαῖς πόλις Αἰγυπτίων καὶ οἰκιστῆρα ἔσχεν Ἐρεχθέα· διὸ καὶ διφυᾶ προσαγορεύεσθαι φασιν ὄντα δίγλωσσον· ἕτεροι δὲ φασιν ὅτι πρῶτος ἐδόξασεν ἕκ τε γυναικὸς καὶ ἀνδρὸς τοὺς γεννωμένους παράγεσθαι καὶ διὰ τοῦτο διφυῆς ἐδοξάζετο, περὶ μὲν οὖν τούτου πολλὴ διαφορά· ἕκ δὲ τῆς ἀποικίας ὠνομάσθαι φησὶ πολιοῦχον τὴν Ἀθηναίαν . . . Οἰον. καὶ οὔτε ἡ γῆ ἱστόρῃται ἐπὶ τοῦ Χάρακος ἀποίκους Σαίτων εἶναι τοὺς Ἀθηναίους . . . πρῶτον δὲ Ἀθηναίων οἰκιστῆρα τὸν Ἐρεχθέα ᾄδουσιν, ὃν καὶ διφυῆ διὰ τὸ ἐξ ἑκατέρων γλωσσῶν εἶναι, Ἀττικῆς καὶ Αἰγυπτιακῆς, ἐκάλεσαν. ἕτεροι δὲ διφυῆ ἐκάλεσαν διὰ τὸ δεῖξαι πρῶτον αὐτὸν παράγεσθαι τοὺς γεννωμένους ἕκ τε ἀνδρῶν καὶ γυναικῶν.

¹ Jacoby, *Marmor Parium*, p. 6, v. 12-p. 7, v. 13 (and p. 61ff.): ἀφ' οὗ Δημήτηρ ἀφικομένη εἰς Ἀθήνας καρπὸν ἐφ[εῦρ]εν καὶ πρ[ο]ηροσία ε[π]ρά[χθη] πρ[ώ]τῃ δεῖξαντος Τριπτολέμου τοῦ Κελεοῦ καὶ Νεαίρας, ἔτη ΧΗΔΔΔΔΓ<Ι>, βασιλεύοντος Ἀθήνησιν Ἐριχθέως. 13. ἀφ' οὗ Τριπτό[λεμος] ἐθέρισε τὸν καρπὸν δν] ἔσπειρεν ἐν τῇ Παρίαι καλουμένῃ Ἐλευσίνι, ἔτη Χ[Η]ΔΔΔΔΓ, βασιλεύοντος Ἀθηναίων Ἐριχθέως . . . cf. also Justin, II, 6.12, "Erechtheum . . . sub quo frumenti satio est Eleusinae a Triptolemo reperta." And *Marmor Parium*, p. 7, v. 15: [ἀφ' οὗ] Εὐμολπος . . . τὰ μυστήρια ἀνέφηνεν ἐν Ἐλευσίνι καὶ τὰς τοῦ [πατρὸς] Μουσαίου ποιη[ε]ις ἐξέθηκ[εν]. ἔτη ΧΗ, βασιλεύοντος Ἀθηναίων Ἐριχθέως τοῦ Πανδίωνος.

From this it is obvious that Erechtheus as well as Cecrops was described as διφυής, and for the same reasons¹ (unless of course the two have simply been confused by Charax or another), and there may well have been others to whom the same epithet was applied.

29.2 Foucart, *Les Mystères d'Éleusis*, p. 20-40, originally suggested an Egyptian origin for the Eleusinian mysteries, basing his theory on the similarity between the Isis-Osiris story and the Eleusinian myth, taken in conjunction with the Danaus legend. This theory was dismissed as untenable by Picard, "Sur la patrie et les pérégrinations de Demeter", *Rev. des Ét. Gr.*, XL, 1927, 321-330, on the grounds that no objects of Egyptian origin which can be dated to the second millennium have been found in the sanctuary of Eleusis. And indeed up to the present day no indications of Egyptian influence have been discovered.²

Traditionally, Demeter came to Greece from another land and the lack of evidence indicating the existence of an earlier shrine at Eleusis suggests that the cult was introduced from another part of the Greek or Mediterranean world. Apollodorus, III, 14.7 places the arrival of Demeter and Dionysus in Attica during the reign of Pandion, which the Marmor Parium gives as c. 1462-1423 B.C. And according to this same stele, Demeter was introduced into Athens in the reign of Erechtheus c. 1409-8 B.C. It seems likely then, that the introduction of the cult may be placed in the second half of the XVth century. Its origin remains uncertain. There is no evidence of a Cretan origin any more than of an Egyptian one. Possibly the cult may have come from the north around Thessaly or Thrace, as Eumolpus, the first celebrant, was reputed to have come to Eleusis from Thrace.³

29.4 The Eumolpidae were an Eleusinian priestly family, whose name was drawn from their important liturgical function, εὐ μέλπεσθαι. The founder of the family was traditionally Eumolpus, a son

¹ See above ch. 28.6.

² A tomb dated to the end of the Geometric period and found to contain Egyptian objects cannot be regarded as proof of Egyptian influence as the date is too late. In all probability the owner was either Egyptian or had visited Egypt. See Mylonas, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries*, p. 61.

³ Mylonas, *op. cit.*, p. 14ff.

of Poseidon, to whom Demeter revealed her mysteries. He appears to have had some connection with Ethiopia, if not Egypt: according to Apollodorus, III, 15.4, Eumolpus was cast by his mother, Chione, into the sea, but his father Poseidon rescued him and took him to Ethiopia to be reared. He was subsequently banished from there, and found refuge first with the king of Thrace and later with the Eleusinians.

The claim of the Kerykes to fame has not been clearly explained, because of the confusion of tradition. Founded by the son of Eumolpus, they seem definitely to have occupied a subsidiary position to the Eumolpidae, while retaining similar privileges.

CHAPTER 30

30.3 The Troglodytes are described at length by Diodorus in Book III, 32f.

30.4 The Barathra was the marshy tract around Pelusium and towards Lake Serbonis, lying on the main military road between Egypt and Palestine. When covered by sand after a storm the marsh offered a deceptively firm appearance and made travel along the highway treacherous.¹ It was presumably into quicksands such as these that the Egyptian army disappeared when pursuing the Jews from Egypt, although this probably occurred further south at the northern extremity of the Red Sea.

30.4 The Σερβωνίδος λίμνη of the Greeks is identified by Clédat, "Notes sur l'isthme de Suez", *BIFAO*, XXI, 1923, 145-187 and XXII, 1923, 135-189, with the Egyptian lake of *Km wr*, or Lake Baudouin.

CHAPTER 31

31.6f. The passages on which this description of Egypt is undoubtedly based are quoted above in the introductory section p. 8f. What is immediately apparent from the passages in question is that there existed some confusion as to what was actually meant by Diospolis or Thebes. Although the description apparently belongs

¹ Cf. Diodorus, XVI, 46.5f. for Ochus' disaster in this area.

to a city, the statistics, particularly of villages and men, are surely applicable to the whole country (as Diodorus in fact applies them). Moreover, although Thebes in Homer, *Il.*, IX, 381ff. designated the city, by the time of Herodotus the name seems to have been applied not only to the city, but also to upper Egypt. And Aristotle, *Meteor.*, I, 14, 351b, goes further: τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἢ Αἴγυπτος Θῆβαι καλούμεναι.¹ Whatever the cause or explanation of the confusion Diodorus ignores it and rationally applies the statistics to the whole of Egypt, not merely to a single city.²

¹ Strangely enough, the name Αἴγυπτος is conjectured to have come from *hwt k3 Pth*, the name of the temple of Ptah at Memphis and originally applied only to this city. However, foreigners must have used the name for the whole of the Nile basin until it became the accepted name of the country (Gardiner, *Anc. Eg. On.*, II, p. 211*). Montet, *Géographie*, I, p. 32 disagrees on the grounds that *hwt* becomes in Greek *δ* or *ά* (e.g. *Hwt-Hr* becomes "Αθρ), but clearly the borrowings belong to completely different periods, Αἴγυπτος being borrowed much earlier than the rest, and therefore quite possibly following a different phonetic progression.

² The relevant passage of the Homeric Scholia is quoted by Letronne, "Examen des passages relatifs à la population de l'ancienne Thèbes d'Égypte", as follows: 'Ὡς δὲ Κάτων ἱστορεῖ, ἡ Διόσπολις ἡ μεγάλη, πρὸ τοῦ ὑπὸ Περσῶν ἀφανισθῆναι κώμας μὲν εἶχε τρισμυρίας, τρισχιλίας, (τριακοσίας) καὶ τριάκοντα, ἀνθρώπων δὲ μυριάδας ἑπτακοσίας. ἑκατὸν δὲ πόλεσι διεκοσμεῖτο· τινὲς δὲ φασὶ ὅτι ρ εἶχε πύλας· ἐξ ἑκάστης δὲ ὀπλῖται μύριοι, χίλιοι δὲ ἵπποι ἐξεστράτευνον . . . (Schol. Venet. ad *Il.*, IX, 383). The reading πόλεσι clearly suggests that the entire description applies to the country as a whole. But Letronne took his information from Villoison's edition of the *Iliad* (Venice: Colet Brothers 1788), which contained a text of the poem based on Venetus A, and a text of the Scholia combining the commentaries of Venetus A and B and possibly others. (For this information I am indebted to the late Professor John Davison of the University of Leeds). The passage quoted is from the B Scholia, and the latest edition is that of Dindorf, who reads πύλαις in place of πόλεσι. Letronne suggests that a commentator believing the Thebes of Homer to refer to the whole country, misinterpreted ἑκατομύριοι as ἑκατόμ-πολις. But until the respective readings of Villoison and Dindorf can be checked by reference to the original manuscript, Letronne's theory cannot be substantiated. Certainly the numbers of men and villages cannot apply to a single city. Possibly † Κάτων, the ultimate source of the Scholia, described Egypt using what was thought to be its older name, Thebes. Later Hellenistic writers might then assume that the term referred only to the city which they knew as Diospolis, and in quoting † Κάτων, unthinkingly recorded figures impossible for a city.

CHAPTER 32

32.1 The Nile, on which the whole structure of Egyptian civilization depended, was in Egyptian mythology connected with the primordial water, Nun, which was thought to lie beneath the earth. Its flood waters were believed to rise out of caverns near Aswân, or possibly at Gebel Silsila, south of Thebes. Even when the boundaries of Egyptian influence pushed farther south to Napata during the New Kingdom, the old ideas of the source of the Nile were maintained.

The source of the main stream of the Nile lies in fact in Lake Victoria. Above Khartoum it is joined by the Blue Nile flowing from the Abyssinian plateau, and two hundred miles further south by the River Atbara. The latter is the only tributary of the river north of Khartoum, and the Nile thereafter winds its solitary way towards the Mediterranean, over a total distance of 4,160 miles.¹

32.3 The earlier Greek writers made the Nile the boundary between the continents of Asia and Africa, thus dividing Egypt between the two continents. Herodotus, II, 16f. is somewhat obscure, but appears to be establishing the fact that by this reckoning Egypt or at least the Delta, lying as it does between two branches of the Nile and thus belonging to neither Asia nor Africa, must be considered a fourth continent.

CHAPTER 33

33.1 According to Strabo, XVII, 1.5, Meroë was so named by Cambyses because his sister Meroë, or according to others, his wife, died there. In fact the word is native, occurring first in the form B(e)ru(e) or M(e)ru(e) in hieroglyphs in historical inscriptions of the IVth century B.C.²

33.3 According to Lucas, *Ancient Egyptian Materials and Industries*⁴, p. 209, "Strabo possibly refers to the E. desert of Egypt, when, in describing Ethiopia, he says that 'There are also mines of copper,

¹ See H. Kees, *Ancient Egypt*, p. 47f.; W. A. Fairservis, *The Ancient Kingdoms of the Nile*, p. 23ff.; Bonneau, *La crue du Nil*, p. 11-26.

² Kees, in *RE*, XV, 1, 1048-54.

iron and gold' (XVII, 2.2), and Diodorus has practically the same statement, namely 'It is said there are in it (i.e. in Ethiopia) mines of gold, silver, iron and brass...'; but the geography of this time was very vague, and S. Ethiopia, which was in the Sudan, or even the Sudan generally, where such mines exist, may have been meant' rather than the N. part of Ethiopia, which was in Egypt."

But Diodorus and Strabo, whose accounts are very similar, are both more explicit than this, and locate the mines in the so-called island of Meroë. Under the Meroitic Kings, successors of the Napatan pharaohs, gold was one of the main exports of Meroë to Ptolemaic Egypt, and gold objects have been found in large quantities in the royal graves at both Napata and Meroë.¹

There is no mention of copper in the tribute lists from the south, suggesting that copper mining in the E. desert was in the hands of the Egyptians, not the Nubians. Copper objects of an early date have been found. There is some dispute as to whether it was native metal, but certainly it was smelted at a later date.

33.3 Herodotus, III, 97 maintains that ebony² was an object of tribute from Ethiopia, and Diodorus and Strabo, XVII, 2.2, both mention the existence of ebony trees in Ethiopia. Pliny, XXIV, 52, however refutes this. But it is unlikely that Egypt imported it from India before a comparatively late date, and an inscription of King Mernerē' of the VIth Dyn. mentions ebony as a product brought down from "negro-land" on the Upper Nile; while the expedition of Queen Hatshepsut of the XVIIIth Dyn. brought it back with them from the land of Punt.³

According to Lucas, *Materials*⁴, p. 434f., Egyptian ebony was *Dalbergia melanoxylon* (found in tropical Africa). Until some years ago, what is now called ebony was obtained from the tree *Diospyros ebenum* (India and Ceylon), while today it comes largely from *Diospyros Dendo* (W. Africa). There is a possible example of *Diospyros ebenum* dating from the Vth Dyn., but the unlikelihood of its

¹ Vercoutter, "The Gold of Kush", *Kush*, VII, 1959, 120-153.

² The word is in fact Egyptian in origin: *hbny*.

³ The exact location of Punt is uncertain, but it seems to have been somewhere on the E. coast of Africa, possibly Somaliland; see Kees, *Ancient Egypt*, p. 112.

having come from India or Ceylon at this early period would seem to cast further doubt on its already doubtful composition.

33.7 The total number of mouths of the Nile in antiquity does seem to have been seven, but there is no general agreement as to their names. Herodotus gives the names as the Pelusiac, Saitic, Mendesian, Bucolic, Sebennytic, Bolbitine and Canopic mouths; while in Diodorus, Strabo, Pomponius Mela and Pliny they appear as the Pelusiac, Tanitic (in Mela, Cataptystic), Mendesian, Phatnitic, Sebennytic, Bolbitine and Canopic (or Heracleotic).¹ In fact two of the mouths, the Bolbitine and Bucolic (or Phatnitic) were man-made channels, while the Mendesian and Saitic or Tanitic branches split off from the Sebennytic. Thus there were only three main branches of the Nile: the Pelusiac, Sebennytic and Canopic, naming them from East to West.²

33.9 The canal from the Nile to the Red Sea was, according to Strabo, XVII, 1.25, first cut by Sesostris. It was subsequently restored by Necho, though both Herodotus, II, 158f., and Diodorus believe him to have left the work unfinished. Herodotus does not mention whether Darius actually finished the canal or not, but both Diodorus and Strabo record that he left it unfinished, persuaded that the Red Sea was higher than Egypt, and would flood the country if the canal were cut.

The canal left the Nile near Bubastis, following the Wadi Tumilat to the Bitter Lakes, and then turning south along the course of the present canal to the Red Sea. It was in existence much earlier than is recorded by Classical authors, perhaps even as early as the XIIth Dyn. An inscription from one of five stelae discovered records that it was restored by Darius, the main purpose apparently being to

¹ According to Diodorus the Canopic branch was also called the Heracleotic, and it appears under this name in Ptolemy also. Ball, *Egypt in the Classical Geographers*, p. 75n, suggests that since Pliny distinguishes between the Canopic and Heracleotic mouths, while Ptolemy says they are identical, we may suppose that the Heracleotic branch of Pliny ran out from the Canopic but had ceased to exist as a separate branch by Ptolemy's time; however, this is difficult to accept in the light of Diodorus' statement that they were identical. It seems more likely that Pliny was in error.

² Gardiner, *Ancient Egyptian Onomastica*, II, p. 153*-159*; Kees, *Ancient Egypt*, map p. 186-7.

provide a route to Persia. Posener, *La première domination perse en Égypte*, p. 75f., inscr. 9 reads: "... Il n'y a pas d'eau en elle ... Faites aller les inspecteurs ... pour creuser (ou recreuser) le canal à partir de ... l'eau(?) ... Faites venir un bateau ... avec (?) des inspecteurs portant tous(?) les dons ... On fit selon (ce qu'avait ordonné Sa Majesté) ... 24 (ou 32) bateaux remplis de ... ils sont arrivés en Perse."

Posener suggests elsewhere¹ that there was originally a natural connection between the Nile and the Red Sea. But as the Red Sea receded (the Bitter Lakes originally formed part of it) and the canal ran lower, it was gradually deepened by hand, until by Classical times it was no longer considered to be a branch of the Nile or even natural. The canal which replaced it was primarily for irrigation purposes, but only needed deepening and widening to be used for navigation. The N.-S. canal joining the end of the Wadi to the Gulf of Suez served no local need, but was for navigation, and presumably it could only have been constructed when the central power was strong enough to undertake large works to improve external communications.

CHAPTER 34

34.2 The *κοχλία* was traditionally the invention of Archimedes (287-212 B.C.) created for the express purpose of removing water from the hold of a large ship built by Hiero II of Syracuse. Diodorus (V, 37) says that screws were in use in mines and wells before Archimedes introduced them into Egypt during a visit to the court of the Ptolemies. But even if Archimedes was not the inventor, the water-screw² could not have been invented before the ordinary screw, attributed by Greek tradition to Archytas of Tarentum, who died in 394 B.C. The water-screw is still used in parts of Upper Egypt and other parts of the Arab world for small lifts, but no longer in the Delta.³

34.6 The flower of the lotus, or *Nymphaea lotus*, contained

¹ "Le canal du Nil à la Mer Rouge avant les Ptolemées", *Chron. d'Ég.*, XIII, 1938, 259-273.

² A screw turning in a hollow cylinder: Vitruvius, X, 6.

³ See Forbes, *Studies in Ancient Technology*, II, p. 37f.

minute grains which formed the principal nourishment of neolithic people, who made a kind of bread from them. The root of the plant was called κόρσιον¹ and could be eaten raw or cooked.

The Egyptian bean, the *Nelumbium speciosum*, was apparently easily confused with the lotus. It grew in the marshes alongside the papyrus plant. The κιβώριον was the flower-head, which, like the lotus, contained grains which were eaten even in the time of Herodotus. According to Theophrastus² the root also could be eaten. Neither word, κιβώριον nor κόρσιον, appears to have an Egyptian etymology.

34.7 There are references to the Persea, or *Mimusops Schimperi*, in Egyptian texts from the XVIIIth Dyn. onwards. Its fruit has been found in many tombs, the earliest specimens dating from the IIIrd Dyn., from the Djoser pyramid complex at Saqqâra.³

34.8 The συκάμινα was the *Ficus sycomorus*, which to the Egyptians was a sacred tree: Osiris was believed to inhabit it while his passion was celebrated during the month of Khoiak. Mixtures for use in religious ritual were covered with its sacred leaves, and the fruit was used in offerings and in certain medical formulae.⁴

There seems to be some confusion here concerning the fruit of the *Ficus sycomorus*. Diodorus mentions two specific kinds of tree, one sort bearing the black mulberry, the other a fig-like fruit. This could be due to the fact that the Greek name for the mulberry (*Morus nigra*) was also συκάμινα.⁵ But it is more likely that Diodorus is referring to the two sizes of fruit which can be obtained from the *Ficus sycomorus*: the fruit only swells and ripens properly if a small cut is made in each. Otherwise the fruit remains small, leading to a great discrepancy in size between the cut and uncut fruit.⁶

¹ Theophrastus, *Enquiry into Plants*, IV, 8.11.

² *op. cit.*, IV, 8.8.

³ See Boerhave Beekman, *Hout in Alle Tijden*, p. 418; Lucas, *Ancient Egyptian Materials and Industries* ⁴, p. 445.

⁴ Boerhave Beekman, *op. cit.*, p. 419-421.

⁵ Athenaeus, II, 51b; Theophrastus, IV, 2.1.

⁶ Keimer, "Sprachliches und Sachliches zu ΕΛΚΩ 'Frucht der Sykomore'", *Acta Orientalia*, VI, 1928, 288ff.

34.9 Theophrastus, *Enquiry into Plants*, IV, 8.1, also suggests that the blackberry, *Rubus ulmifolius*, was found in Egypt, but there is no other evidence for its existence there in ancient times.

34.9 Cf. also 20.4, where barley-beer is described as being little inferior to wine in aroma. Beer-making clearly dates to an early period, and as a result its discovery was attributed to the gods. Jars originally containing beer which has now evaporated leaving a residue, have been found dating back to prehistoric times. In tomb-paintings bread-making and brewing are associated, the former being a necessary step towards the latter. For the principles of brewing and the method of making beer described by Zosimos (late IIIrd century A.D.) see Lucas, *Ancient Egyptian Materials and Industries* ⁴, p. 10-16.

34.11 Kiki is the castor-oil plant, *Ricinus*, which grew wild in Egypt. Evidence of it has been found in graves of the Badarian period, and it is therefore possibly indigenous. The seeds of the plant were used at all stages of Egyptian history, and in Ptolemaic times kiki or croton oil was second only to sesame oil. One of its chief uses was as a medicine, and it is frequently mentioned in the medical papyri.¹ The oil is not mentioned in earlier times as an illuminant, but since olive was not in use until later, kiki and possibly sesame oil must have been used for lighting. Certainly the Classical authors record that this was so.²

Although the word "kiki" is said by Herodotus to be the Egyptian name for the plant and oil which the Greeks called κρότων, this does not appear to be the case. A word *k3k3* occurs in the texts, and it is with this that kiki has frequently been identified.³ But the identification is queried in *Wb. Drog.*, p. 526f., since *k3k3* does not seem to mean castor-oil, which is almost certainly *dgm* (later *tkm*).⁴ This, however, does not necessarily preclude the possibility that kiki is derived from *k3k3* although they do not represent the same substance.⁵

¹ See *Wb. Drog.*, p. 583f., and cf. p. 526f.

² Herodotus, II, 94; Strabo, XVII, 2.5; Pliny, XV, 7.

³ *Wb.*, V, 109.2.

⁴ *Wb. Drog.*, p. 583f.

⁵ See also Dawson, *Aegyptus*, X, 1929, 47-72 for a discussion of the origin of the name kiki.

CHAPTER 35

35.iff. In an Egyptian tale,¹ a crocodile of seven cubits is called "great", while Herodotus records that they grow to seventeen cubits. Aelian, *de Nat. Anim.*, XVII, 6 says that in the reign of Psammetichus one was seen of twenty-five cubits, and in the time of Amasis one of twenty-six cubits. Certainly *Crocodilus niloticus* is known to have reached the length of about twenty feet.

The crocodile lays between forty and sixty eggs, about the size of a goose egg, and places them in the sand, where they are hatched in about a month by the heat of the sand. It prefers open reaches with a sluggish current and numerous sandbanks, and in early times it was distributed over the length of the Nile even into the Delta. Its presence there is recorded in the Christian era by Seneca, *Cf. Quaest. Nat.*, IV, 2. Towards the end of the XVIIIth century it disappeared from the Delta, and has been retreating southwards ever since. A few could still be seen at Abu Simbel in the early 1960's, but the rise of the water due to the High Dam has probably forced them to retreat.

35.6 For the worship of the crocodile see below ch. 84.4 and 89.1. The crocodile god was Sobek; but the crocodile was also regarded as an animal of Seth,² and it must have been as such that the crocodile was hunted and eaten, according to Plutarch, *DIO*, 50, at Apollinopolis,³ where it represented Seth the enemy of Horus of Edfu.

35.7 The ichneumon does indeed eat eggs, but its natural habitat is among the reeds and long grass where crocodiles do not normally deposit their eggs. It will, however, eat crocodile eggs if it comes across them.⁴

35.8 In early times the distribution of the hippopotamus was

¹ P. Westcar (Léfèbvre, *Romans et Contes Egyptiens*, p. 74-77). The crocodile in its wax form measures seven spans; when transformed by magic into a real crocodile it measures seven cubits. (But note the frequent use of the number seven in the story.)

² *Cf.* Herodotus, II, 69; Aelian, *Nat. Anim.*, X, 21; Strabo, XVII, 1.47.

³ Edfu, see above ch. 12.6. See also below ch. 35.10.

⁴ For the cult of the ichneumon see below ch. 87.4.

much the same as that of the crocodile, and it too was found above Cairo. It disappeared from the Delta towards the end of the XVIIIth century, and has vanished entirely from Egypt since firearms became plentiful.

35.10 Hippopotamus hunting seems to have been undertaken only for religious reasons. On the walls of the temple at Edfu there are representations of a play, intended to be performed annually, which included the ritual harpooning by Horus of his enemies, and in particular of Seth, represented as a hippopotamus.¹ These and other similar representations are considered by Save-Soderbergh, *On Egyptian Representations of Hippopotamus Hunting as a Religious Motive*.

CHAPTER 36

36.1 Judging from Diodorus' statements that fish was eaten by men (ch. 36.43) and by the sacred animals (ch. 83) it would appear that fish was not generally considered to be unclean or taboo. It was, however, taboo for all those connected with religion (i.e. the king and the priests²) and the dead. In later times specific regulations were made concerning the eating or avoiding of fish on certain days, and particular fish were taboo in certain nomes.³

Fishing itself was regarded as a pleasant pastime and was frequently represented in tomb paintings.

36.2f. Evidence of the inundation is first seen at Aswân around the beginning of June, but its full height is not reached at Cairo until the end of September.

Diodorus' description of the ease with which the farmers grew their crops, and their recreation during the period of inundation, is undoubtedly vastly exaggerated. In spite of the fertility of the Nile mud, hard work and constant care were needed to raise crops. The whole agricultural system depended on careful irrigation, and canals and dykes therefore had to be kept constantly in good repair

¹ See Fairman and Blackman, "The Myth of Horus at Edfu", *JEA*, XXI, 1935, 26-36; XXVIII, 1942, 32-38; XXIX, 1943, 2-36; XXX, 1944, 5-22.

² Cf. below ch. 70.11.

³ See Griffiths, *Plutarch*, p. 277ff.

to prevent both drought and overflowing. Generally a double harvest was sought each year, and as the level of the river sank, more strenuous efforts were required. The coming of the inundation naturally prevented work in the fields, but the workers turned then to building and handicrafts.

36.4 There are Egyptian representations of the trampling of seed into the ground by cattle and sheep.¹ The purpose seems to have been one of economy of effort—if the animals were left in the fields long enough they fertilized the fields at the same time as trampling the seed.

Occasionally in the Classical authors² the trampling is described as being done by swine, a Sethian animal. The seed corn to be planted then represents the burial of Osiris, who is born again in the new vegetation.³

36.10 The arrival of the innundation on the first day of the new year was in fact the signal for a festival which signified the finding of Osiris by Isis.⁴

36.11 For the existence of a nilometer at Memphis, see also Strabo, XVII, 1.48, καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ, πόλις ἔχουσα ἱερὸν Κνουφίδος καὶ νελομέτριον, καθάπερ Μέμφις. Herodotus, however, does not specifically mention a nilometer at Memphis.

Sethe⁵ maintains that there existed a nilometer on the island of Rodah from earliest times. This suggestion is used by Borchardt, *Nilmesser und Nilstandsmarken*, p. 41f. as a foundation for his calculations. In addition he concludes (p. 54) on the basis of Diodorus' statement, that "der eine Nilmesser hatte zuerst für das ganze Land genügt."

But Gardiner, *Ancient Egyptian Onomastica*, II, p. 139, refutes the antiquity of the nilometer, which was constructed in A.D. 716. This need not preclude the possibility of there having been an earlier

¹ Wreszinski, *Atlas*, I, 97a-b; Wild, *Le Tombeau de Ti*, II, pl. CXIII; Davies, *Rock Tombs of Sheikh Said*, pl. VIII, XVI.

² Pliny, XVIII, 18.168; Aelian, *Nat. Anim.*, X, 16. Spiegelberg, *The Credibility of Herodotus' Account of Egypt*, pl. II.

³ Merkelbach, *Isisfeste in griechisch-römischer Zeit*, p. 32.

⁴ Merkelbach, *op. cit.*, p. 14ff.

⁵ *Untersuchungen*, III, p. 105; *Urgeschichte*, 109.

nilometer on the same spot, but the earliest date of such a construction must remain doubtful. Certainly, as Gardiner points out, no antiquities are recorded from Rodah. Nor is there any textual evidence, since *Pr-H'py*, the "House of the Nile", which Sethe assumed to possess a nilometer and which he believed to have stood on the island of Rodah, has since been proved to have been situated elsewhere.¹

CHAPTER 37

37.3f. Hellanicus of Mitylene,² Cadmus of Miletus³ and Hecataeus of Miletus⁴ all belong to the group of early writers known as *logographoi*, or prose-writers, as opposed to the writers of epic. Under the influence of Ionian thought the *logographoi* assumed a critical attitude towards the poetic and mythological traditions, and were responsible for creating historical science.

As a historian Herodotus gained immediate popularity, but also aroused immediate criticism; while Thucydides and Xenophon were indeed praised for their historical methods, the former for his scientific approach, the latter for his emphasis on the importance of morality in politics.

Ephorus was the first to consider the Greek peninsula as a unity and to write its history from the mythological period down to Philip of Macedon.⁵ Theopompus of Chios, a historian of the IVth century B.C., was banished for Spartan sympathies and restored by Alexander as a help against the pro-Persian oligarchy. On Alexander's death he fled to Egypt.⁶

37.5 In the early years of his reign, Ptolemy II Philadelphus sent an expedition beyond the old frontier of Egypt at the First Cataract,

¹ See below ch. 85.2. For the Rodah nilometer, see Kamel Osman Ghaleb Pacha, *Le Mikyas ou nilomètre de l'isle de Rodah*, (*Mem. Inst. d'Ég.*, LIV).

² A contemporary of Herodotus, and a prolific writer of mythographic works, local and regional history, and chronology. See *FGrH*, i 4, iiiB 40-50.

³ See *RE*, X2, 1473-6; Schmid-Stählin, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, I, 691ff. doubt his historical character on the grounds of lack of extant fragments.

⁴ Fl. c. 500 B.C. As well as a *Periegesis* he wrote a mythographic work dealing *inter alia* with the legends of Herakles and Deucalion. See *FGrH*, i² 1.

⁵ See also above ch. 9.3.

⁶ *FGrH*, ii, B115.

probably in an attempt to reach the Nubian gold-mines, or the hunting-grounds of the elephants with which his army was supplied.¹ He certainly made no attempt to annexe Ethiopia, but the expedition established regular communications between Egypt and Meroë. However, it can hardly be true, as Diodorus maintains, that no Greek before Ptolemy II had even advanced as far as the southern boundary of Egypt, let alone crossed into Ethiopia. Elephantine was held by Alexander's forces, and Greeks and Macedonians stationed there under Ptolemy I have left some of the earliest extant Greek papyri.²

37.7 For the Egyptian belief that the Nile had its origin in the primordial waters under the earth, see above ch. 32.1.

37.9 The origins of the names Astapus and Astaboras are considered by Schäfer, "Nubische Ortsnamen bei den Klassikern", *ZÄS*, XXXIII, 1895, 96-100. Pliny, V, 53.10 says *Astapus, quod illarum gentium lingua significat: aquam e tenebris profluentem. Astaboras, hoc est: ramus aquae venientis e tenebris*. This may be compared with Diodorus' ἐκ τοῦ σκότους ὕδωρ. In Schäfer's view *profluentem* and *venientis* are to be considered as an addition of Pliny, since *aqua e tenebris* is grammatically impossible in Latin. He therefore analyses the names:

Ast + ab(u?) + or = Water + Darkness + Branch
 Ast + abu = Water + Darkness.

37.11 The reference is to Herodotus, II, 32.

CHAPTER 38

38.2 According to Thales, the Etesian wind caused the Nile to flood by hindering the flow of the river to the sea. The Egyptians believed not that it actually caused the flood, but that by slowing down the progress of the already swollen river, it increased the beneficial effects of the inundation.³

¹ Cf. Diodorus, II, 36.

² Bevan, *History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty*, p. 76.

³ S. Sauneron, "Une page de géographie physique", *BIFAO*, LX, 1960, 11-17; see also Bonneau, *La crue du Nil*, p. 151-159.

By "Etesian" Thales presumably meant the north-west winds which blow in summer from the Mediterranean. These were commonly associated with the inundation in antiquity, and we find, for example, in the Calendar of Antiochus for July 14th, Ὡρίων τελείως ἀνατέλλει ἅμα ἡλίῳ καὶ ποιεῖ ὕδατα καὶ ἀνέμους.¹ (This day was the first epagomenal day of the Sothic year, and the birthday of Osiris.)

38.4 The theory here attributed to Anaxagoras is refuted by Herodotus, II, 21, as the most plausible, but the most inaccurate.² It is also to be found in Aeschylus (frg. 304):

ἐν δ' ἥλιος πυρωπὸς ἐκλαμψας χθονὶ
τήκει πετραίαν χιόνα· πᾶσα δ' εὐθαλῆς
Αἴγυπτος ἄγνοῦ νάματος πληρουμένη.

It is in fact not far from the true explanation given below ch. 41.

38.4 The quotation from Euripides is frg. 228 (Nauck).

38.8 This explanation of the inundation of the Nile is to be found in Herodotus, II, 25, and is referred to in Aristophanes, *Nub.*, 273. It is rightly attacked by Diodorus, and Aristides, II, 341, on the grounds that if it were true, other rivers in Africa might be expected to show the same phenomenon.

CHAPTER 39

39.1 Democritus of Abdera, author of the atomic theory, was a contemporary of Socrates and a prolific writer. See also below ch. 98.3.

39.3 Heavy rain is indeed the true reason for the annual inundation of the Nile, although Democritus' explanation of the origin of the rain-clouds is not entirely accurate.³

39.7f. For a discussion of the meaning of καινοτάτην in its present context, see above p. 22.

Ephorus' theory concerning the Nile is ascribed to Book XI of

¹ Boll, *Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie*, 1910, no. 16.

² See further, Bonneau, *La crue du Nil*, p. 161-169.

³ See below ch. 41.

his history.¹ For the general disparagement of Ephorus, see above p. 21f.

Herodotus (II, 10) also talks of the formation of the Delta from alluvial deposits in a passage which seems to owe much to Hecataeus of Miletus.²

CHAPTER 40

40.1f. Although the theory here reported is ascribed to the "wise men in Memphis", the Egyptians in fact believed that the Nile had its source at Aswân.³ The theory seems rather to have a Greek flavour; though the Greeks, beginning with Eratosthenes, believed the earth to be divided into five, not three, zones: a torrid zone, two temperate zones, and two arctic zones.⁴ However, it is not inconceivable that later Egyptians should have developed a similar theory. Nor is it, as a theory, entirely ridiculous, since the White Nile does rise south of the equator.

40.5 That the earth was spherical may have been maintained by the Pythagoreans, perhaps before the end of the VIth century B.C., but it was not generally accepted until the time of Aristotle. Thus both Hecataeus of Miletus and Herodotus seem to have believed that it was flat.⁵

The Greeks had no conception of gravity, and so to them a river flowing over a curved surface would always have to flow uphill.

CHAPTER 41

41.1 Oenopides of Chios was a mathematician and astronomer of the Vth century B.C. of whom little is known. See Diels, *Vorsokratiker*, I, 393-5, and below ch. 98.3.

41.4 Agatharchides of Cnidos was a historian and geographer of the IIInd century B.C., from whose work this whole geographical

¹ *FGrH*, 70, F 65e. For his theory see Bonneau, *La crue du Nil*, p. 184-6.

² *FGrH*, I, F 301 with Jacoby's comments.

³ See above ch. 32. See also Bonneau, *op. cit.*, p. 143-150, 171f., 199f.

⁴ Ball, *Egypt in the Classical Geographers*, p. 35.

⁵ Ball, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

section may be taken.¹ This theory, of which he is supposed to be the author, is in fact correct. The Nile flood results from the rain-clouds which gather in the South Atlantic Ocean and are driven eastwards to fall as heavy tropical rains upon the Abyssinian tableland from April to September,² and which are carried immediately into the White Nile by the Blue Nile and Atbara. The flood water of the Blue Nile succeeds in damming back the waters of the White Nile for a time; and these in turn help to lessen the decrease of the flood waters, and prevent the Nile from drying up in the dry season.

CHAPTER 42

42.1 This sentence as it stands is almost certainly not from the hand of Diodorus, who invariably refers to himself in the first, not the third, person. It is also perhaps worth noting that the summary of the contents of the first part of the book omits several topics which are in fact included in the earlier section, notably the chapters on Egyptian colonization.

However, although the following sentence returns to the use of the first person, it does not seem to follow easily or naturally the closing words of ch. 41. It is in fact almost a repetition of the last sentence of ch. 41, though the wording is very different. One wonders whether the whole of this chapter is not an interpolation.

CHAPTER 43

43.1f. *Agrostis*, or *Cynodon dactylon*, Dog's-tooth grass, is described by Theophrastus, *Enquiry into Plants*, I, 6.7, I, 6.10; IV, 10.5-6.³ He does not, however, mention its nutritive properties, and Diodorus' description might well refer to the lotus or reed already

¹ See above p. 21-25.

² Cf. the words of Cleomedes, *De mot. circ.*, I, 6, p. 56, 27 (= *FGrH*, 87, F 78, Posidonius) ἐπεὶ καὶ περὶ τὴν Αἰθιοπίαν ὕμβροι συνεχεῖς καταφέρουσθαι ἱστοροῦνται περὶ τὸ θέρος καὶ μάλιστα τὴν ἀκμὴν αὐτοῦ, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ ὁ Νεῖλος πληθύνει τοῦ θέρους ὑπονοεῖται. See Bonneau, *La crue du Nil*, p. 196-208, for the prevalence of this theory among the Classical authors.

³ According to Tackholm and Drar, *Flora of Egypt*, I, p. 335f., *agrostis* is bent-grass.

described in ch. 34. This accords well with the theory of Morenz and Schubert, *Der Gott auf der Blume*, p. 77f., who connect Diodorus' reference to man as a creature of swamp and marsh with the use of the lotus for food by early man.¹

The lotus was closely associated in Egyptian mythology with the origin of the world: the primeval god was believed to have emerged from the primordial waters in the form of a lotus. At Memphis the god was known as Nefertem, "wholly beautiful", the son of Ptah. When the god was eventually endowed with human form, he was represented as the youthful sun-god seated amongst the open petals of a lotus.²

43.4 The reed-dwellings may well have been the earliest form of shelter from the elements. Later the reeds would be plastered with clay to improve their effectiveness. Diodorus is probably correct in saying that the herdsmen still made use of reed huts in his day: even today temporary shelters of maize stalks can be seen in the fields.³

43.5 The names of the legendary first king of Egypt occurs variously in the Classical authors as Μῆν (Herodotus, II, 99); Μήνης (Manetho, Eratosthenes, Pliny, VII, 193); Μινάιος (Josephus, *Ant. Ind.*, VIII, 6.2); Μῆνις (Apion ap Ael.); Menon (Pliny, VII, 193); Μείνιος (Plutarch, *DIO*, 8); and Μνεύης (Diodorus, I, 94).

Menes of the Classical authors, *Mni* in Egyptian king-lists, is perhaps to be equated with Narmer, the first known king of the Ist Dyn.⁴ There is, however, still a certain amount of controversy concerning the exact identity of Menes, and further suggestions are

¹ "Vielleicht scheint sie in späten rationalistischen Aussichten durch, die Diodor (I, 10 und 43) in Zusammenhang mit dem Lotos als Nahrungsmittel über die Ur-Entstehung von Menschen und Tieren in Ägypten wiedergibt. Dass Tiere entstünden, bei denen nur der Oberkörper ausgebildet ist und dass der Mensch seiner Natur nach ein 'sumpf- und teichartiges Wesen' sei. Man möchte das letztere geradezu eine (natürlich späte und kaum ägyptische) rationalistisch-ätiologische Parallele zum kosmogonischen Mythos um das Urwesen auf der Blume nennen."

² Kees, *Ancient Egypt*, p. 83; Bonnet, *Reallexikon*, s.v. Nefertem.

³ Lucas, *Ancient Egyptian Materials and Industries*, p. 48.

⁴ Edwards, "The Early Dynastic Period in Egypt", *CAH*², I, ch. XI, p. 8-10; Gardiner, *Egypt of the Pharaohs*, p. 402-8.

that he is to be identified with Hor-Aha the successor of Narmer, or even that he is a legendary combination of Narmer and Hor-Aha.¹

43.6 Hermes is the Egyptian god Thoth, see above ch. 16.

CHAPTER 44

44.1 The 180th Olympiad covers the years 60/59-57/56 B.C. Ptolemy the New Dionysus (Ptolemy, XI, 80-51 B.C.) is better known as Auletes, the Flute-player, and as father of Cleopatra.

44.2f. Diodorus cannot here be relying upon Manetho for his information, since although the latter records the reigns of four Ethiopian kings, he lists them as ruling consecutively: Sabacon, Sebichos and Saracus/Tar(a)cus of the XXVth Dyn., and Ammeris of the XXVIth Dyn.

The Ethiopians ruled c. 715-663 B.C., the Persians 525-404 B.C. One notable revolt of the Egyptians against the Persians occurred under Darius, and was finally quelled by Xerxes in 484 B.C. In 404 B.C. the rule of the Persian kings who comprised the XXVIIth Dyn. came to an end, and from then until her conquest by Alexander the Great, Egypt struggled to maintain her independence against a Persian empire which continued to regard her as a rebellious province.

44.4 If the Macedonians have been ruling for 276 years, Diodorus must be writing in the year 56 B.C., that is immediately after his visit to Egypt. See further above ch. 4.

Not all the earlier kings of Egypt were native rulers, as Diodorus seems to imagine. He totally ignores the Hyksos rulers of the confused Second Intermediate Period (?1786-1575).²

44.4 In fact there seem to have been four native queens who assumed the throne: Nitocris of the VIth Dyn.; Sobkneferu of the XIIth Dyn.; Hatshepsut of the XVIIIth Dyn.; Tewosret of the XIXth Dyn.; Manetho ap. Theophilus, *Ad Autolyc.*, III, 19, includes in the XVIIIth Dyn. a queen Acencheres, daughter of Orus; and

¹ Emery, *Archaic Egypt*, p. 32-37.

² Gardiner, *Egypt of the Pharaohs*, p. 148-172; Hayes, "Egypt from the Death of Ammenemes III to Seqenenre II", *CAH*², II ch. II.

R. Hari, *Horemheb et la reine Moutnedjemet*, p. 227f., argues that this may indicate an independent reign of Mutnedjmet.

44.4 Exactly which sacred books Diodorus is referring to is uncertain. His description of their contents seems to accord more with the Palermo Stone,¹ which records important events of the early reigns, than with a document such as the Turin Canon,² which is merely a list of royal names.

CHAPTER 45

45.1 Articles of furniture containing the rudiments of traditional Egyptian design were being made as early as the latter part of the fourth millennium B.C. Shortly before this, copper became available, making possible techniques which had been difficult or impossible with flint tools. By the Ist Dyn. the basic principles of wood working were well established: the oldest known wooden furniture has been found in Ist Dyn. tombs (c. 3100 B.C.) and although the remains are fragmentary, they show sufficient development to indicate that the early beginnings of furniture in Egypt are older than was originally thought.³ From this period various types of bed frames have survived. Stone stands appear to have been in general use in the early dynastic period, and, although none have survived, it is possible that there were similar stands of wood.⁴

45.2 Tnephachthus must be Tefnakhte of Sais of the XXIVth Dyn., the father of Bocchoris. He is not mentioned by Herodotus, but Plutarch, *DIO*, 8 gives an almost identical account of his advocacy of the simple life. This may be based on a passage in the stele of Piankhi which relates how the Delta prince Tefnakhte, who had seized power in the west, was subdued by Piankhi: "I have not sat in the beer-hall, nor has the harp been played for me; but I have eaten bread in hunger, and I have drunk water in thirst, since that day when thou heardest my name . . . Cleanse (thy) servant of his

¹ Gardiner, *op. cit.*, p. 62ff.

² Gardiner, *op. cit.*, p. 47f.

³ Baker, *Furniture in the Ancient World*, p. 19.

⁴ See Harris, "Egypt", in *World Furniture* (ed. Hayward), p. 10-13.

fault, let my possessions be received into the Treasury, of gold and every costly stone, and the best of the horses, (even) payment for everything."¹ This hardly suggests, however, that Tefnakhte's return to the simple life was a voluntary exercise.

45.4 Busiris, here named as the founder of Thebes, appears to be a purely mythical figure.² At any rate, he cannot be identified with any known Egyptian king.

In an earlier chapter (15) Diodorus attributes the foundation of Thebes to Osiris. But in both these chapters Diodorus is labouring under a misapprehension in considering Thebes to be an earlier foundation than Memphis. At the time when the rulers of the Old Kingdom were building their pyramids in the vicinity of Memphis, then the main city of Egypt, Thebes was little more than an insignificant village. Not until the XIth Dyn. did Thebes begin to assume any importance in Egyptian affairs.³

45.5 The size of houses must have varied considerably, according to whether they were in the country, where there was room for a spacious single-storey construction, or in a densely populated area where, as in Rome, space was achieved only by building upwards. In most cases single-storey houses appear to have had further accommodation on the roof, where it was cooler, so that they were virtually of two stories. Town houses in the Middle and New Kingdoms probably had at least three stories, and there are models from the Graeco-Roman period showing tower-like houses, one of four or five stories, together with an accessible roof and basement.⁴ It is therefore quite possible that Thebes was well-known in Egypt for its tall houses and splendid adornments, and that Diodorus had heard of this. But by his own day the city was a shadow of its former self, as the result of a three-year siege in the reign of Ptolemy VIII.

45.6 The quotation is from Homer, *Il.*, IX, 381-4.

¹ Breasted, *AR*, IV, 880.

² See also ch. 17.3; 67.11; 88.5. For the foundation of Thebes see also above ch. 15.1.

³ Gardiner, *Egypt of the Pharaohs*, p. 116ff.

⁴ Davies, "The Town House in Ancient Egypt", *Metropolitan Museum Studies*, I, pt. 2, May 1929, 233-255.

45.7 There is no reason to doubt the existence of post-stations in Egypt, though the evidence for them is literary rather than archaeological: there existed a postal relay in Achaemenid times, and Herodotus (VIII, 98) ascribes its invention to the Persians. But there appears also to be a reference to its existence in a love-song of the Ramessid¹ era:¹ "O si tu pouvais venir en hâte vers la bien-aimée comme le courrier royal dont le maître attend le message avec impatience, son cœur aspirant à l'entendre. Des écuries entières sont harnachées pour lui, les chevaux l'attendent aux étapes, le char attelé est à sa place. Le courrier n'a pas de répit en route. Lorsqu'il parvient à la maison de la bien-aimée, son cœur s'abandonne à la joie."

CHAPTER 46

46.2 There is no way of telling exactly which four of the temples at Thebes Diodorus has in mind. He probably includes the two large temples at Luxor and Karnak on the east bank of the Nile; but the west bank contains a succession of mortuary temples from Qurna to Medinet Habu. Of these, probably the two most outstanding complexes would have been the Ramesseum and the great temple of Ramesses III at Medinet Habu.

The temple which Diodorus refers to as "the oldest" must be the Great Temple of Amūn at Karnak.² If it is indeed this, Diodorus is for once fairly conservative in his estimate of its size: the temple is over 1,220 feet long, and 338 feet at its widest point. But the massive pylon at the west front is 370 feet wide, 142½ feet high and 49 feet thick.

The wealth of Amūn was certainly vast. In addition to the lands and estates belonging to it, the temple was enriched by numerous offerings made to the god. And since it was involved in little expenditure, the wealth of Amūn may well have surpassed that of the king. The position of the temples under Ramesses III and the

¹ P. Beatty, I, v. 9, 1, 1-4, trans. Posener, "L'apport des textes littéraires à la connaissance de l'histoire égyptienne", *Le fonti indirette della storia egiziana*, p. 19.

² See Barguet, *Le temple d'Amon-Rê à Karnak* (Cairo, 1962); for the development of the temple, Kees, *Ancient Egypt*, see index, s.v. Karnak.

amount of land owned by them is described in P. Harris I. From the figures, which still hold difficulties, Erman estimates that Amūn possessed at least one-tenth of the cultivable lands.¹

46.4 Almost certainly the excesses against the Egyptian religion attributed to Cambyses are greatly exaggerated.² A Jewish document of the late Vth century B.C.³ also speaks of the destruction of all Egyptian temples in the time of Cambyses, but the story may have arisen from the withdrawal of official grants to the temples, which had previously been the custom.⁴

46.7 Strabo, XVII, 1.46 says that in his own day there were about forty royal tombs which were *θέας ἄξιαι*. Richard Pococke (XVIIIth century) describes fourteen. Today sixty-two are known, but only seventeen of them are easily accessible. However, not all of the tombs are royal ones: some are private tombs and some are little more than small burial pits.

CHAPTER 47

47.1 The tombs of the "concubines of Zeus"⁵ are probably those in the Valley of Queens (now known as Bibân el-Harîm), which lies about 1½ miles from the Ramesseum, i.e. about ten stades. The mortuary temple of King Nebhepetrê' Mentuhotpe II contains tombs and chapels for the favourites of the harem, but Diodorus

¹ *Zur Erklärung des Pap. Harris*, (Sb. Berl. Akad., 1903).

² E.g. the story that he slew the Apis bull. Two Apis bulls are recorded for his reign; and according to its inscription, the sarcophagus of one of them was actually dedicated by Cambyses. (Posener, *La première domination Perse en Égypte*, p. 30ff.) Perhaps the very fact that there were 2 Apis bulls gave rise to the story that he slew the first.

³ Pritchard, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament*, p. 492.

⁴ Gardiner, *Egypt of the Pharaohs*, p. 364; Kienitz, *Die politische Geschichte Ägyptens*, p. 55-60.

⁵ Jones, in his edition of Strabo (Loeb, vol. VIII, p. 125), associates this passage with Strabo, XVII, 1.46; τῶ δὲ Διί, ὃν μάλιστα τιμῶσιν, εὐειδεστάτη καὶ γένους λαμπροτάτου παρθένος ἱεράται ἅς καλοῦσιν οἱ "Ἕλληνες παλλάδας (? παλλακίδας, Xylander). αὕτη δὲ καὶ παλλακένει καὶ σύνεστιν οἷς βούλεται, μέχρις ἂν ἡ φυσικὴ γένηται κάθαρσις τοῦ σωμάτων· μετὰ δὲ τὴν κάθαρσιν δίδεται πρὸς ἄνδρα· πρὶν δὲ δοθῆναι πένθος αὐτῆς ἄγεται μετὰ τὸν τῆς παλλακείας καιρὸν. This may perhaps be a reference to the Divine Wife of Amūn.

makes no reference to any superstructure, which he must surely have done, had he been referring to the buildings at Deir el-Bahari.

47.iff. The monument of Osymandyas is almost certainly the Ramesseum, the mortuary temple of Ramesses II, built on the site of an earlier temple.¹ The name Osymandyas is derived from the prenomén of Ramesses II, Usima'rē.²

Much of Diodorus' description of the monument seems to be reasonably accurate. Thus his *πυλῶνα λίθου ποικίλου* must be the pylon at the east entrance to the temple. This appears to have been originally 220 feet broad, which agrees with the two *plethra*, or 200 feet, of Diodorus. The exact meaning of *ποικίλου* is discussed by Letronne, *Mémoire sur le tombeau d'Osymandyas, décrit par Diodore de Sicile*, (1822), p. 4f. The term is generally applied to marked stones, such as granite or porphyry, whereas the pylon is of sandstone. This difference is only one of the many pieces of evidence which in Letronne's view render impossible the identification of the monument of Osymandyas with the Ramesseum.³ It should perhaps be said that even now the identification is by no means established beyond doubt⁴. But such differences as occur in Diodorus' description may perhaps be the result of a confused recollection of the Ramesseum and another temple of similar construction—perhaps that at Medinet Habu.

Diodorus' estimate of the peristyle court as four *plethra* or 400 feet long on each side is clearly an exaggeration.⁵ But the *ζῶδια πηχῶν ἑκατάδεκα μονόλιθα* is an obvious reference to the square pillars which engaged statues of Osiris. They are not however monoliths. Similarly, it is difficult to believe that the roof described by Diodorus (that is, the roof of the colonnade) was built of a single stone.

¹ See Goossens, "Le Tombeau d'Osymandyas", *Chron. d'Ég.*, XVII, 1942, 177-184; Porter and Moss, *Topographical Bibliography*, II², p. 43iff., for a detailed bibliography; Quibell, *The Ramesseum*; Vandier, *Manuel d'Archéologie égyptienne*, II, 2, p. 700-713.

² Griffiths, "Shelley's Ozymandias and Diodorus Siculus", *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, (Cambridge), XLIII, 1948, 80-84; Vergote, "Le Roi Moiris-Mares", *ZAS*, LXXXVII, 1962, 66-76.

³ Further evidence is given by Letronne, *Mémoire sur le monument d'Osymandyas à Thèbes*, (1831).

⁴ See e.g. Bataille, *Les Memnonia*, p. 119-142.

⁵ Letronne, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

Nor is there any evidence of the decoration here described.

47.3 The "black¹ stone of Syene", from which Diodorus says the three statues were carved, must be black granite and may perhaps be a translation of its Egyptian name *inr km*.²

The phrase τρεῖς ἐξ ἑνὸς τοῦς πάντας λίθου μέλανος τοῦ Συηνίτου . . . is usually translated "three statues, each of a single block of stone"; but Griffiths in a communication on this passage in *CR*, LXII, 1948, 114, suggests that all three statues were carved from the same block. He points out that it was normal for statues to be produced from a single block of stone, and that it must have been the fact that three statues, instead of just one, were carved from the single block which impressed Diodorus. But this suggestion must be treated with caution: throughout his narrative Diodorus describes Egyptian statues as monolithic,³ and it is obvious that he was struck by this fact. Moreover, groups consisting of a central seated figure with subsidiary figures reaching only to its knees were not uncommon,⁴ and there is no particular reason why they should have impressed Diodorus.

47.4f. Unfortunately this statue has presumably been destroyed, but the remains of a colossus of Ramesses II lie in front of the ruins of the west side of the wall. The total height of this statue has been estimated as $57\frac{2}{5}$ feet. The breadth across the toes is given as $4\frac{1}{2}$ feet, so that Diodorus' reckoning of the foot as seven cubits is just possible. There is no evidence of an inscription such as Diodorus records, but on the colossus just mentioned the name is inscribed on the upper arm and the seat. βασιλεὺς βασιλέων is a direct translation of a title known in Egypt from a fairly early date. It occurs as an epithet of Osiris⁵ and of kings.⁶

¹ Reading μέλανος for Μέμνονος.

² See Harris, *Lexicographical Studies in Ancient Egyptian Minerals*, p. 74.

³ Cf. I, 47.2 and 5; I, 48.5; I, 57.5.

⁴ Examples can be seen in Scamuzzi, *Museo Egizio di Torino*, pl. LVII-LIX. The Abu Simbel colossi are also of this type, as are the Luxor statues of Ramesses II, on either side of the pylon and of the door-way from the court into the colonnade.

⁵ *Wb.*, II, 328, 7.

⁶ *Wb.*, II, 329; see also Brugsch, "Ein Decret Ptolemaios des Sohnes Lagi, des Satrapen", *ZAS*, IX, 1871, 1-13.

47.5 There is no evidence of a statue of the mother of Ramesses II, though the statue of a Ramessid queen has been found in the Ramesseum.¹ Diodorus' "three crowns" seems to be a reference to a composite crown consisting of three elements which also occur separately,² and the Ramessid statue is surmounted by a coronet which may have supported other elements.

47.6 The "war against the Bactrians" is the campaign of Rameses II against the Hittites in the fifth year of his reign, the climax of which was the battle around the city of Kadesh on the upper Orontes.³ The size of the army is undoubtedly exaggerated, but it was indeed divided into four divisions. The divisions were named after the four gods Amūn, Rē', Ptah and Sutekh, and were recruited respectively from Thebes, Heliopolis, Memphis, and the Delta residence of Pi-Ramesse (perhaps Tanis).⁴

CHAPTER 48

48.1 The reliefs which Diodorus describes as covering three walls appear to be those on the wall between the courts, where the king is shown besieging Kadesh, a city surrounded by a river.

There are indeed representations of a lion in the Kadesh inscriptions. The lion was the royal animal *par excellence*, and Ramesses II was as a warrior compared to a lion.⁵ Thus it appears that Diodorus is not altogether wrong in suggesting that the lion is symbolic of the king's courage and strength. However, it is hardly surprising if the representation of the lion was interpreted literally, and the story that Ramesses II kept a tame lion to assist him in battle may well have been an exaggeration. In Breasted's view, the lion which

¹ Now in the Cairo Museum, No. 600. See Borchardt, *Statuen und Statuetten*, Cat. Caire, II, pl. 1084, p. 152.

² Cf. an XVIIIth Dyn. representation of Tutankhamun's wife, wearing a coronet surmounted by a sun-disk enclosed in horns, and two feathers. (Carter-Mace, *The Tomb of Tut-ankh-Amen*, I, pl. II).

³ Breasted, *The Battle of Kadesh* (Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago 1904); Gardiner, *The Kadesh Inscriptions of Ramesses II*.

⁴ See Gardiner, *op. cit.*, p. 5; see also Schulman, "The Nṛn at the Battle of Kadesh", *JARCE*, I, 1962, 47-52.

⁵ De Wit, *Le rôle et le sens du lion dans l'Égypte ancienne*, p. 24f.

Diodorus describes as accompanying the king was nothing more than a decorative part of his chariot,¹ and he draws attention to the representation at Abu Simbel of a lion in the same position on two separate chariots.² At the same time he admits that Ramesses II did have a tame lion (one is shown in the Egyptian camp on the north tower of the first pylon) but denies that this took any part in the battle.

48.2 Diodorus is mistaken in describing the captives being led away by the king, *τά τε αἰδοῖα καὶ τὰς χεῖρας οὐκ ἔχοντας*: it is not shown on what remains of the Ramesseum reliefs, although it is portrayed in those at Abu Simbel³ and those at Abydos which deal with this campaign. The Ramesseum reliefs show Ramesses in his chariot with the hands of the slain, not of the prisoners, cast before him.

48.4 There is no trace of any altar in the court, and indeed very few altars have survived in Egyptian temples. But the court did contain colossal statues of the king; and fragments of one of these, in black granite, still lie on the ground.

From this court three entrances led into the great hypostyle court,⁴ while the vestibule, situated on a terrace, was reached by three flights of steps. There is no evidence that the court was used for legal proceedings, but the question is discussed by Seidl, *Ägyptische Rechtsgeschichte der Saiten- und Perserzeit*, (1968), p. 32, and he concludes that it was a "gerichtshalle."⁵

48.6 The seated figures of gods, as for example, the judges of the dead, are often shown without hands: , and it may be a representation such as this which Diodorus has in mind.⁶ Apuleius,

¹ Breasted, *op. cit.*, p. 44f; refuted by Schweitzer, *Löwe und Sphinx im alten Ägypten*, p. 51.

² Breasted, *op. cit.*, pl. VI; Gardiner, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

³ Breasted, *op. cit.*, pl. VI.

⁴ Compared by the Greeks to an Odeum, being distinguished from a theatre by its roof and supporting pillars.

⁵ For the Egyptian legal system, see further below ch. 75ff.

⁶ Reading *ἄχειρας* in the text with Hertlein on the basis of Plutarch, *DIO*, 10; *ἐν δὲ Θήβαις εἰκόνες ἦσαν ἀνακείμεναι δικαστῶν ἄχειρες* κτλ . . . The word is needed as a foundation for the idea in the following sentence that the judges should not accept gifts.

XI, 10, describes how the model of a left hand was carried in procession in the cult of Isis. It formed an emblem of justice, because the slower left hand seemed more impartial than the right.¹

CHAPTER 49

The whole question of this chapter has been investigated by Derchain, *Le tombeau d'Osymandyas et la maison de la vie à Thèbes*.² He suggests that the buildings here detailed are not part of the temple proper (since the ambulatory is not necessarily within it, but may be that surrounding the temple and separating it from the brick magazines), but form part of the magazines, and more particularly that section to the north-west of the temple. This is based upon Vandier's study of the Ramesseum,³ in which there is a description of a room in the north-west section of the magazines, which was probably reserved for scribes, and of a corridor and the traces of two staircases. Here was situated the administrative centre and scriptorium of the temple when it was still active. For this reason it would have been remembered by the priests, although it, and the majority of the rest of the temple, would have been in ruins by Diodorus' own time. This, Derchain believes, is indicated by γενέσθαι φάσιν at the end of the chapter, the subject of which must be the Egyptians, as is the case with ἔφασαν two lines above. Of this he says, "l'imparfait . . . indique évidemment que l'information provient déjà d'Hécatée d'Abdère."

Derchain therefore sees Diodorus' account as a mixture of real and literary allusions, with the description as far as ch. 48 being based on the actual ruins, and ch. 49 forming an attempt at archaeological reconstruction on the part of the Egyptians. Chapter 49, then, in his view constitutes a theoretical description of the ideal

¹ Tran Tam Tinh, *Le culte d'Isis à Pompei*, p. 99 records that such a model has been found in the temple of Isis at Pompei, and Merkelbach, *Isisfeste in griechisch-römischer Zeit*, p. 40 sees it as representing Isis-Dikaio-syne-Maat. However, it has been suggested that Apuleius is referring to the ordinary Egyptian censer which terminates in an open palm. Cf. Weigand, "Thymia-teria", in *Bonner Jahrbücher*, CXXII, 1912, 2-15.

² *Göttinger Vorträge vom Ägyptologischen Kolloquium der Akademie am 25-26 August 1964*, p. 165-171.

³ *Manuel d'Archéologie*, II, 2, 712.

"House of Life", "le théâtre d'un rituel ayant pour objet le préparation et la conservation d'une figurine momiforme d'Osiris qu'on y conservait jusqu'à son renouvellement, comme support de la vie dans l'Égypte entière."

The Egyptian description of a "House of Life" (that at Abydos) is to be found in P. Salt 825.¹ The "House of Life" was closely connected with both magic and medicine;² and it was a place of learned discussion and composition, where interpretations were given and the conduct of festivals determined. Possibly there were many such houses attached to temples, though few have been discovered.³ Their administration was connected with that of the temple, although they may have been situated outside the temple precincts.

According to Gardiner,⁴ the houses do not seem to have contained their own libraries. On the other hand, some, and possibly all temples did have their own libraries. Gardiner identifies the library of the Ramesseum with the first eight-columned room behind the hypostyle court, and not the room behind that, as has generally been believed. The books, dealing with theology, astronomy, magic, rituals, etc., were known as "the souls of Rē", referring to the solar origin of life.⁵ It is possible that here lies the basis for the inscription apparently to be seen above the library, "healing-place of the soul." The purpose of the books was to maintain the life of the universe.

With Diodorus' description of a number of chambers set in a circle, Derchain compares the reference in P. Salt to the four blocks of buildings surrounding the place where the mummiform figure of Osiris was kept. And in the latter he sees the basis for Diodorus' claim that the body of the king was buried there. The epithet *εἰκοσίκλινος*, he suggests, is a reference to the paintings on the walls, and he compares the Osirian chapel at Dendera, where nineteen couches are depicted with the mummy of Osiris in various stages of

¹ Derchain, *Le Papyrus Salt 825*, (*Acad. roy. de Belgique Mém.*, LVIII, 1a, 1965.)

² See the statue of Udjeharresnet, Posener, *La première domination Perse en Égypte*, p. 1ff.

³ One has been found at El-Amarna: Pendlebury, *City of Akhenaten*, III, p. 115.

⁴ "The House of Life", *JEA*, XXIV, 1938, 157-179.

⁵ Derchain, *Le Papyrus Salt*, p. 54ff., and 140.

mummification and resurrection.¹ Zeus and Hera were identified with Amūn and Mut, who, according to Theban custom, had a place in most sanctuaries. The offering scenes of the ambulatory Derchain compares with those at Edfu, where forty-two separate gods, representing the forty-two nomes of Egypt, are shown receiving offerings.

The astronomical ceiling described by Diodorus must be fictitious as it stands, because it would be too big for the Ramesseum, and indeed for most temples. No astronomical ceiling so far discovered accords with Diodorus' description in giving the daily changes in the sky, although stellar clocks are to be found in the tombs of the New Kingdom.² The remaining astronomical ceiling of the Ramesseum shows only the monthly changes in the sky.³

CHAPTER 50

50.1 Presumably when Diodorus here refers to the "Thebans", he means the Egyptians in general;⁴ unless of course he is using a specifically Theban source at this point. His statement is, however, in accordance with his misconception of the superior antiquity of Thebes compared with that of Memphis.⁵

50.2 Parker, *The Calendars of Ancient Egypt*, demonstrates that the Egyptian calendars, in common with all early calendars, were lunar not solar in origin. It is not until the development of agriculture that there arises the necessity for an astronomical or solar calendar to prevent the natural agricultural seasons becoming out of step with the calendar.

The original Egyptian lunar calendar in use at an early date was apparently based on an astronomical observation, the heliacal rising of Sothis,⁶ the feast of which was always celebrated in the last month

¹ Mariette, *Denderah*, IV, p. 69-72.

² See below ch. 81.4.

³ See Parker and Neugebauer, *Egyptian Astronomical Texts*, I and II; also Gardiner, "The Problem of the Month-names", *Rev. d'Ég.*, X, 1955, pl. I.

⁴ Cf. above ch. 31.7.

⁵ See above ch. 45.4.

⁶ See above ch. 19. Even before this there must have been a primitive calendar based on the inundation of the Nile.

of the year. But because the lunar month averaged $29\frac{1}{2}$ days, giving a twelve-month year of 354 days, the calendar could only be regulated by the introduction of an intercalary month every two or three years to ensure that the festival of the rising of Sothis fell in its correct month. P. Carlsberg 9, although of late date, provides a scheme based on the civil calendar for determining the beginning of lunar months over a twenty-five year cycle, and indicates the "great" years of thirteen months. In addition, the beginning of each month was originally determined by observation, not by arbitrary means, and in Egypt fell on the morning when the old crescent could no longer be seen.

The lunar year was essentially a religious and priestly year, and it was replaced in the life of the people by a civil calendar. This was a schematic or conventional year, consisting of 365 days, divided by analogy with the lunar year into three seasons each of four months of thirty days, with the addition of five epagomenal days at the end of the year, regarded as a short intercalary month. The rejection, at least for administrative and economic purposes, of the uncertain lunar month and the adoption of a conventional month may be regarded as the Egyptians' main contribution to the calendar.

The means by which the Egyptians arrived at a year of 365 days has long been under discussion. Neugebauer's theory¹ that they averaged the intervals between the successive risings of the Nile (a widely variable phenomenon) is improbable, because at the earlier date which he proposes for the introduction of this calendar, such a procedure was probably beyond their capabilities. And by his later date a lunar calendar based on the heliacal rising of Sothis already existed. Sloley, "The Origin of the 365-day Egyptian Calendar", *ASAE*, XLVII, 1948, 261-265, suggests that this number was reached by averaging the days between the annual heliacal rising of Sothis. Parker proposes either this method, or the averaging over a period of the lunar year which was itself based on the rising of Sothis. But as Parker further points out, the new civil calendar cannot have been tied to the rising of Sothis at its introduction, but rather to some yearly occurrence which was variable, so that

¹ "Die Bedeutungslösigkeit der 'Sothisperiode' für die älteste ägyptische Chronologie", *Acta Orientalia*, XVII, 1938, 169-195.

the gradual shift forward of the civil calendar was not immediately apparent.¹ If the rising of Sothis had marked the starting point of the year, the insertion of a sixth epagomenal day every four years would have been so simple and obvious that the failure to make just such a correction indicates that this was not the starting point. The new civil calendar must have been tied to the earlier lunar calendar, and because the start of the latter was variable, the movement of the civil calendar passed unnoticed for many years.

When after some time the discrepancy in the civil calendar became obvious, the result was apparently the creation of a special lunar year whose months were regulated to keep general agreement with their schematic equivalents. This was the later lunar calendar. The original religious lunar year, which was controlled by the rising of Sothis, and was therefore unalterable, could continue independently while the later lunar and civil calendars could progress through the seasons, and all three calendars continued in use until the end of pagan Egypt.

In spite of their very early observations of the heliacal rising of Sothis, from which they might have determined the true length of the year, the Egyptians seem to have had no conception even at a late date of the $365\frac{1}{4}$ day year. There is no evidence at all for an Egyptian fixed year, and indeed the Canopic Decree of 238 B.C. specifically speaks against such a theory. This decree of Ptolemy III constitutes an attempt by the Greeks to reform the wandering calendar, and orders the inclusion in future of a sixth epagomenal day every four years.² But it failed in the face of opposition from the Egyptian priests, who must have feared some interference with the religious significance of the epagomenal days.³ It was not until 30 or 26 B.C. that the Romans succeeded in instituting the Alexandrian calendar, and arresting the civil calendar in its forward shift by the measures proposed in the Canopic Decree.⁴

¹ But according to Thomson, "The Greek Calendars", *JHS*, LXIII, 1943, 52-65, the discrepancy between the calendars was a deliberate device on the part of the Egyptians to increase the accuracy of chronological reckoning.

² Dittenberger, *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae*, 56. See also Groff, *Les dieux versions démotiques du décret de Canope*.

³ See above ch. 13.4.

⁴ Parker's theory concerning the Egyptian calendars is not, it must be

Diodorus is evidently wrong in assuming that the Egyptian calendar was reckoned by solar observation, and it is clear that at least at the date when he visited Egypt, the Egyptians maintained their year of 365 days. But the date of Diodorus' death is uncertain, and it is possible that he lived to see the introduction of the $365\frac{1}{4}$ day year under the Romans. Certainly the Egyptians at no time adjusted the civil calendar by the intermittent intercalation or subtraction of days. Since this civil year was introduced for administrative and fiscal purposes, the difficulties involved in adjustment (other than by the regular addition of a leap year, which they did not contemplate) would have been too great.¹

The Greeks seem to have gone their own separate ways in the regulation of their calendars, though it must be said that our information on the subject is far from complete.² However, while each city state had its own calendar, the structure was basically the same: the year consisted of twelve lunar months of 29 or 30 days. This resulted in an annual deficit of $11\frac{1}{4}$ days when compared with the solar year of $365\frac{1}{4}$ days.

The Greeks began their attempts to regulate the calendar at an early date by intercalating one month every other year.³ This gave an ordinary year of 364 days and an intercalated year of 384 days. But this resulted in a total of c. 737 days for the two calendar years against $730\frac{1}{2}$ of two solar years, so that every eight years the calendar gained one month over the solar year. To remedy this the Greeks omitted one of the four intercalary months in each eight-year cycle: but even this failed to keep pace with the moon to the extent of $1\frac{1}{2}$ days in each cycle. To correct this discrepancy, in 432 B.C. the astronomer Meton proposed a nineteen-year cycle,

said, universally accepted. Gardiner, "The Problem of the Month-names", *Rev. d'Ég.*, X, 1955, 9-31, believes him to be wrong, since, although he denies that the Egyptians ever corrected their calendar by intercalary days, his theory of an original lunar year involves the intercalation of whole months. And this in spite of the Canopic Decree which refutes any earlier use of intercalation. See also Schott, *Altägyptische Festdaten*.

¹ Parker, "Sothic Dates and Calendar 'Adjustment'", *Rev. d'Ég.*, IX, 1952, 101-108.

² See Thomson, "The Greek Calendar", *JHS*, LXIII, 1943, 52-65; Bickerman, *Chronology of the Ancient World*.

³ Geminus, 8.26.

probably importing it from the Orient.¹ This was further improved by Callippus in 330 B.C., and by Hipparchus in c. 125.

But although considerably more accurate, these cycles do not seem to have been adopted by the various cities, which persisted in their own haphazard form of intercalation, often dictated by political motives. This is true even of the Athenian calendar, in which as late as the IInd century B.C. two successive years could have extra months.

50.3 Ouchoreus is almost certainly, as Vogel suggested, a corruption of Ὀχυρεύς and as such is a translation of the Egyptian name *Mn*, "he who endures."² Certainly the story told of Ouchoreus corresponds with what Herodotus says of Menes, founder of the Ist Dyn.³

50.5 There is a dam in the neighbourhood of Koschesch which protects the whole province of Gîza from inundation. Bahr el Jusuf is higher than the plain and floods it during the inundation, Memphis being habitable only when the stream is checked. Herodotus, visiting the region during the inundation, mistook the flood waters for lakes.

50.6 Like so many authors, Diodorus ascribes greater antiquity to Thebes than to Memphis. But traditionally Memphis was a political foundation of Menes, the unifier of Upper and Lower Egypt,⁴ and its position at the apex of the Delta was a direct outcome of the establishment of the double kingdom at the beginning of the Ist Dyn.

Thebes did not achieve any degree of importance until the New Kingdom when it became the capital city of Egypt, a supremacy culminating in the foundation of the Theban theocracy by Hrihor in the XXth Dyn.⁵ However, Diodorus (like the other Greek authors)

¹ Neugebauer, *The Exact Sciences in Antiquity*, p. 26.

² Edwards, "The Early Dynastic Period in Egypt", *CAH*², I, ch. XI, p. 10. See also Eratosthenes ap. Syncellus, p. 171.

³ Herod., II, 99: for an analysis see Sethe, *Beiträge zur ältesten Geschichte Ägyptens* (*Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Altertumskunde Ägyptens*, III), Leipzig, 1905.

⁴ Herod., II, 4, 99; Gardiner, *Egypt of the Pharaohs*, p. 408.

⁵ See Gardiner, *op. cit.*, p. 177-314 passim; below ch. 65.

is not entirely unjustified in his assumption: Memphis never faded into complete obscurity, and it remained the centre of operations during the resistance of the Lower Egyptian princes against the Ethiopians. Moreover, after Alexander's conquest of Egypt and the foundation of Alexandria, Memphis was initially chosen by him as the capital of Egypt. Alexander himself was even buried there in 321 B.C. But at some point between 321-312 B.C. Alexandria became the capital city of Egypt,¹ and the cultural centre of the Hellenistic world.

CHAPTER 51

51.2 Gardiner, *Notes on the Story of Sinuhe*, p. 77f., believes that there are several expressions which Diodorus may have had in mind when he says that the Egyptians called their tombs αἰδίους οἴκους: *ist nt nhh*, "place of eternity" (tomb) or *niwt nt nhh*, "city of eternity" (necropolis); *pr-dt* has also been translated "house of eternity",² probably, however, under the influence of Diodorus, who may have made the same mistake himself. But as Gardiner points out, there are sufficient Egyptian terms which Diodorus might have translated as αἰδίους οἴκους without including the doubtful *pr-dt*.

The same expression for "tomb" was also used by both Greeks and Romans. Thus we find in Xenophon, *Agesilaus*, XI, 16 the term αἰδίους οἴκησις, and in Latin inscriptions, *domus aeterna*. There is no reason then why the Egyptians should not have had a specific phrase which Diodorus is here translating, but in the absence of more definite evidence it is easier to believe that he is translating a concept rather than an actual expression.

51.3f. This story is clearly a myth, and an allegorical explanation of the dependence of Egypt on the fertilizing force of the Nile. But Moret, *La mise au mort du dieu en Égypte*, p. 13, sees allusions in the Pyramid Texts to the Nile carrying off women: (Pyr. 1553) "Ils tremblent ceux qui voient le Nil Hapi quand il bat ses vagues"; (Pyr. 507)³ "Osiris, c'est le premier flot de la crue ... (Pyr. 510)⁴

¹ Kees, *Ancient Egypt*, p. 180; Murray, in *JEA*, LVI, 1970, 142 and n. 2.

² Vandier, *La Religion Égyptienne*, p. 116.

³ This begins a spell comparing the king to the crocodile god Sobek.

⁴ Translated by Faulkner, "I am the owner of seed who takes women from

c'est un mâle qui enlève les femmes à leur maris, et qui les emmène au lieu qui lui plaît, quand son cœur se prend de désir."

There seems to be evidence that originally a maiden was sacrificed by being cast into the Nile to ensure by this sacred marriage a sufficient inundation. The human sacrifice must have been replaced at an early date by statues and images; and in A.D. 1657 Thévenot saw the rites of the full Nile on 18th August, when male and female wooden statues were cast into the waters.¹

It may be that the Greeks recognized the connection between the Nile (Egyptian Ha'py) and the Apis bull.² Later attempts to combine Greek mythical history with Egyptian led to the attribution of the foundation of Memphis to an Argive king, Apis or Epaphus. As a variant, Apollodorus, II, 10, records that an Egyptian king called Epaphus married Memphis, daughter of Nile. The name Memphis is in fact derived from *Mn-nfr-(Ppi)*, "Pepi is established and beautiful", which was originally the name of the pyramid and pyramid city of Pepi I. It occurs in Greek as early as Herodotus.

51.5 Moeris has been identified with Amenemhet III of the XIIth Dyn., but there is considerable confusion among the Classical authors over the rendering of the name. Diodorus himself does not seem to connect the builder of the Labyrinth, whom he names as Mendes or Marrus in ch. 61, with the excavator of Lake Moeris, although he doubts the Herodotean tradition that the Labyrinth was built under the Dodecarchy. Vergote, "Le roi Moiris-Mares", *ZAS*, LXXXVII, 1962, 66-76, has shown that the forms Moeris, Mendes and Marrus, and Menas (Diodorus, I, 89.3) have all developed from the prenominal of Amenemhet III, Nema'rē'.

In his article Vergote maintains that no trace of Amenemhet III has been found at Memphis, but in this he appears to be mistaken. A lintel and jamb of this king have been found close to the north wall of the temple of Ptah, indicating that although much of the material dates from the XIXth Dyn., there was an earlier XIIth

their husbands whenever he wishes . . ."; but by Mercer, "N is lord of semen, which women receive from their husbands whenever N wishes."

¹ Cf. Plutarch, *De Flum.*, 16.

² See Bonnet, *Reallexikon*, s.v. Apis, Nil.

Dyn. construction on this site.¹ Herodotus and Diodorus appear then to be correct in their assertions.

Helck, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho und den ägyptischen Königslisten*, p. 45, believes that Herodotus attributes the propylaea to Moeris because of a confusion between the similar names of Amenemhet III and Amenhotpe III, and the presence near the temple of Ptah of a statue of the royal scribe of Amenhotpe III, also called Amenhotpe. But although he refers to Petrie's work, Helck apparently disregards the evidence of the lintel and jamb.

51.5 The Fayûm lies about sixty miles from the site of Memphis, and into this depression the Nile flowed during the period of inundation.

Herodotus, II, 6 estimates the schoenus as 60 stades, but Strabo, XVII, 1.24 says that it varied from 30 to 120 stades.² The schoenus is the Egyptian *itrw* "river-measure", now estimated at 20,000 cubits or 10.5 kilometres,³ although it seems more than probable that it was in fact a variable unit of measurement.

51.5 The problems of Lake Moeris have been investigated thoroughly by Caton-Thompson and Gardner. In their article, "Recent Work on the Problem of Lake Moeris", *Geographical Journal*, LXXIII, no. 1, 1929, they conclude that by dynastic times the lake in the depression of the Fayûm had sunk to about 140 feet above the present level of Birket Qarun. This was the result of desiccation and the silting up, since neolithic times, of the Hawâra channel which connected the lake with the Nile. Clearly the Classical tradition that the Fayûm was converted into a reservoir in the XIIth Dyn. must have some historical foundation; and in their view the excavation in question must have been the re-cutting at this time of the Hawâra channel. This would have made possible the irrigation

¹ Porter and Moss, *Topographical Bibliography*, III, p. 217; Petrie, *Memphis*, V, p. 32 and pl. LXXVII.

² See also Liddell and Scott s.v. *σχοῖνος*.

³ Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar*, ch. 266.2. Is it possible that the word *σχοῖνος*, of which one meaning is "rope" or "cord", has any connection with the Egyptian measure *ḥt* or "rod", of 100 cubits, also called *ḥt nt nwḥ* "rod of cord"?

of the higher plateau, and brought into use what was formerly marshland.¹

Strabo, XVII, 1.37 appears to know that the lake and channel were not originally man-made: ταῦτα μὲν φυσικά, ἐπίκειται δὲ τοῖς στόμασιν ἀμφοτέροις τῆς διώρυγος κλεῖθρα κτλ . . .

CHAPTER 52

52.2 Herodotus, II, 149 also refers to the canal, but does not mention that it was excavated. If Diodorus is here referring to the Hawâra channel, this may represent an alternative, and possibly more accurate tradition, which accords with Miss Caton-Thompson's theory.

To effect the drainage and irrigation of the land, some kind of water barrage would have been necessary. It is possible that some of the water was returned to the Nile valley to remedy any deficiency in the flood level, thus giving rise to the tradition of a lake reservoir. That it should have cost fifty talents for an individual to open or close the locks is incredible.

52.3 The relationship between the name of the king and that of the lake has been the subject of much discussion. There is obviously a connection between the name Moeris and the Egyptian *Mr-wr* "great lake" or "great canal", but the exact geographical application of the term *mr-wr* is the subject of some dispute.² Gardiner, *Ancient Egyptian Onomastica*, II, p. 115*f. gives *Mr-wr* as the name of the town Kôm Medinet Ghurâb. In "The Name of Lake Moeris", *JEA*, XXIX, 1943, 37ff., he suggests that ἡ Μοίριος καλουμένη λίμνη of Herodotus, II, 149 is a translation of the Egyptian *t3 hn(t) n Mr-wr*, where *Mr-wr* with the town determinative refers not to the king, but to the town, probably Kôm Medinet Ghurâb; or possibly to the channel at the mouth of which the town stood.

Of the connection between the names of the king and the lake,

¹ See also Caton-Thompson and Gardner, *The Desert Fayum*; Andebeau, "La légende du Lac Moeris", *Inst. d'Ég.*, XI, 1930, 105-127; see also Kees, *Ancient Egypt*, p. 22off. for a summary of the problem of Lake Moeris.

² The various theories are summarized and criticized by Vergote, "Le Roi Moiris-Mares", *ZAS*, LXXXVII, 1962, 66-76.

Posener, *Dictionnaire de la civilisation Égyptienne*, s.v. Amménémès et Fayoum, says: "Un hasard remarquable aura contribué à sa gloire posthume. Le nom Mares (de Nemaârê sur son premier cartouche) qu'on lui donne couramment à une époque récente, ressemble au nom du lac Qaroun, dans le Fayoum: 'lac de (la ville) Miouer.' On confondra les deux en Moeris et on s'imaginera que le roi ainsi appelé a creusé le bassin et lui a donné son nom."

52.4 The pyramids to which Diodorus refers must be the pedestals which are all that remain of the Biahmu colossi of Amenemhet III. The Arab name for these pedestals, which are about 21 feet high and stand 200 feet apart, is Kursi Faraoun, "throne of Pharaoh." From the archaeological evidence, Petrie estimated that they supported seated figures, the height of which was about 35 feet.¹ This, together with a base of 4 feet and pedestals of 21 feet, gave a total height of around 60 feet.

The tradition that these "pyramids" and statues stood in the centre of the lake originated with Herodotus. Since he was in Egypt during the period of inundation,² in all probability what he saw was not a continuous lake, but various basins flooded with irrigation water, creating the impression of a vast lake. From a distance the Biahmu colossi would appear to be actually in the water.³

CHAPTER 53

Sesoösis or Sesostris⁴ was in the eyes of the Classical authors the most famous of the Egyptian kings. Although the figure behind the Sesostris legend was in origin undoubtedly historical, the mass of stories which had accumulated around him by Classical times almost obliterated the historical foundation of the legend.

The exact identity of the king known as Sesostris was for many years a controversial subject. In spite of the evidence of Manetho

¹ Petrie, *Hawara, Biahmu and Arsinoe*, p. 53ff.

² Sourdille, *La durée et l'étendu du voyage d'Hérodote en Égypte*.

³ See Caton-Thompson and Gardner, *Recent Work on the Problem of Lake Moeris*, p. 57.

⁴ See also Lange, *Sesostris, ein ägyptischer König in Mythos, Geschichte und Kunst*; Hayes, "The Middle Kingdom in Egypt", *CAH*²; Malaise, "Sésostriis, pharaon de légende et d'histoire", *Chron. d'Ég.*, XLI, 1966, 244-272.

to the contrary, early Egyptologists persisted in the belief that he was to be identified with Ramesses II, partly because of the Asian campaigns of the latter which are reflected in the Sesostri legend, partly because of the occasional abbreviated writing of the name Ramesses as *Sstsw*. This theory ignored the fact that Manetho specifically includes him in the XIIth Dyn. as the third king on his list. The evidence was disregarded from the start because the name of the Egyptian king with whom Sesostri should then correspond was originally read as *Usertesen*, and the difference between the two names was felt to be too great to admit their identity. Sethe, however, in his article "Sesostri", *Untersuchungen*, II, 1902, established that the name should be read not *Usertesen*, but *Senwosret*; and that in this form it might easily be transformed by Classical authors into Sesostri. This argument he develops further in "Der Name Sesostri", *ZÄS*, XLI, 1905, 43-57. He proves moreover, that the first king of the XIIth Dyn., called by Manetho *Sesonchosis*, is none other than Senwosret I, and that both *Sesonchosis* and *Sesostri* originated in variant writings of the name *Senwosret*. Most Classical authors, beginning with Herodotus, use the form Sesostri. Diodorus alone calls him Sesösis.¹

The evidence for the chronological position of Sesostri is collected and examined by Sethe, who concludes that the traditional Sesostri is basically a combination of the kings Senwosret I and Senwosret III, with the emphasis on the former. It is apparent, however, that not all the deeds attributed to Sesostri were performed by the Senwosrets. Historical fact in time became exaggerated, and as notable deeds were performed by later kings, so the legend of Sesostri was expanded to embrace them all. Similarly as the sphere of Egyptian influence was extended, so the field of action of the legendary hero was widened. Thus although Ramesses II achieved a similar peak of fame, the record of his deeds, far from replacing the Sesostri legend, merely supplemented it. From the Classical evidence it is clear that Herodotus and later authors confused

¹ But cf. Tacitus, *Ann.*, VI, 28 for Sesosis. Montet, *Germanicus et le vieillard de Thèbes*, p. 51 subsequently suggested that the form was a transcription of the name of Ramesses II, Sesosou. This too is refuted on philological grounds by Malaise, *loc. cit.*, who believes it to be a "popular" version of the name Senwosret.

Ramesses II with the original Sesostris. And by the time of Diodorus the legend had developed yet further, so that the Sesoösis of his account is made to surpass the deeds of Alexander the Great, even to the extent of conquering India.¹

Posener, *Littérature et Politique dans l'Égypte de la XIIe Dynastie*, suggests that the Sesostris legend must be considered as representing the spirit of the dynasty in all its aspects. It was an age which followed a period of little notable activity, and was the more outstanding in contrast. The founder of the dynasty, Amenemhet I, a man of non-royal descent, adopted the name "Repeater-of-births", and appears thereby to have recognized in his accession a new era of Egyptian history. The ensuing years saw the creation of the Nubian Empire, consolidation in the north-east, and the growth of diplomatic relations with Western Asia. At the same time Egypt herself enjoyed for the most part a period of internal prosperity and political stability, as evidenced by the widespread building of her kings, increased communications, and advances in the all-important irrigation system.

Of the kings of this dynasty, both Senwosret I and Amenemhet III were later regarded as divine; and in the case of the former there is evidence that his worship as a god began during the XIIth Dyn. itself.

53.2 It was customary in Egypt for the children of nobles to be educated with the royal children, and the practice is attested in inscriptions of all periods.² In the Instruction of Amenemope,³ Amenemhet appears to be warning his son Senwosret I against too close an association with his companions, in case he should be betrayed as his father was.

53.5 There are no indications of XIIth Dyn. military action in Arabia proper. The term "Arabia", however, also designated the region between the Nile and the Red Sea, and there is evidence of expeditions to the north-east of the Delta: the Prophecy of Neferti⁴

¹ Denied by Megasthenes, ap. Strabo, XV, 686; Arrian, *Indica*, V, 4.

² Brunner, *Altägyptische Erziehung*, p. 16f.; Bevan, *History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty*, p. 123.

³ Griffith, "The Millingen Papyrus", *ZAS*, XXXIV, 1896, 35-51.

⁴ Gardiner, "New Literary Works from Ancient Egypt", *JEA*, I, 1914, 100-106.

mentions a victory over the Asiatics, and the inscription of Nesmont¹ of the fourth year of the coregency of Amenemhet I and Senwosret I records the subjugation of the *Mntiw-hriw*-s. The expedition appears to have taken place in the Eastern desert against the unruly Bedouin of the Sinai peninsula, who became more aggressive under the lax rule of the last king of the XIth Dyn. It was against such incursions of the nomads that the "Wall of the Prince" must have been built.² At a later date, Senwosret III made a further expedition against the Asiatics, and according to the stele of Sebekkhu³ reached Sekmem (probably Shechem in Samaria).

The Prophecy of Neferti also refers to the downfall of the Libyans, and there is further evidence in the story of Sinuhe:⁴ it is said of Senwosret, "c'est lui qui domptait les régions étrangères tandis que son père restait dans l'intérieur de son palais." It was from this expedition against the Libyans that Senwosret was suddenly recalled by the assassination of his father. After his accession, action in the West appears to have been restricted to punitive expeditions against the Libyans, and the maintenance of communications with the oases.

53.7 The accession of Senwosret I is dated to 1971 B.C., the twentieth regnal year of his father Amenemhet I, when the coregency of father and son was officially acknowledged. The coregency lasted ten years until the death of Amenemhet in a palace conspiracy during the thirtieth year of his reign. Senwosret's reign continued until 1928 B.C.

53.8 Athyrtis is almost certainly the goddess Hathor, who seems to have become closely connected with foreign countries through her special link with Senwosret: the name Senwosret means "son of Wosret", a goddess who is believed to have been a local, Theban form of Hathor. As the patron deity of Senwosret, and the goddess of precious metals and their sources,⁵ Hathor might well have be-

¹ Breasted, *AR*, I, 494ff.

² See below ch. 57.4.

³ Breasted, *AR*, I, 680.

⁴ Léfèbvre, *Romans et contes égyptiens*, p. 9. See also [Bates, *The Eastern Libyans*, p. 212.

⁵ Stadelmann, *Syrisch-Palästinensische Gottheiten in Ägypten*, p. 3f.

come the tutelar deity of his expeditions outside Egypt. Thus Diodorus sees in her the inspiration of Sesoösis' legendary attempt to conquer the world.¹

53.8 With πρὸς τὴν τῶν ὅλων δυναστείαν compare the unusual title *nb-r-dr* "universal lord", which occurs in the Instruction of Amenemope.² It indicates total supremacy, and few of the gods were entitled to the epithet: it belonged originally to the sun-god, subsequently to Osiris, and occasionally to others.

53.8 For temple incubation, see above ch. 25.3.

CHAPTER 54

54.1 After the murder of Amenemhet I, Senwosret I appears to have taken stern and vigorous measures against the insurgents, to re-establish the authority of the throne. Posener, *Littérature et Politique*, p. 82, n. 5 records, "La vizir de Sésostris Ier, Mentouhotep, dit avoir maté 'celui qui s'est revolté contre le roi'." Possibly the attempts to gain the goodwill of the people, to which Diodorus refers, reflect the relaxation of such measures as Senwosret may have taken at this time. Alternatively it may be a sign of the idealism with which later generations regarded the XIIth Dynasty.

54.3 The number of nomes in Egypt varied at different stages of the country's history. In the Old Kingdom there were 38 or 39, but the number was later increased to 42. However, Strabo, XVII, 1.3, also says that there were 36 nomes, of which the Thebaid contained 10, the Delta 10, and the intermediate tract 16.

The division of the country into nomes, which Diodorus attributes to Sesostris, must refer to the reforms of Amenemhet I. This king relied upon the support of local governors in his bid for the kingship. But once he had achieved this, far from abolishing the nomarchies which had become virtually hereditary principalities, he restored to them many of their ancient privileges. At the same time he was responsible for the complete re-organization of the country: "... His

¹ See Te Velde, *Seth God of Confusion*, p. 110.

² *ZAS*, XXXIV, 1896, 35-51.

Majesty had come that he might crush iniquity . . . and that he might repair what he found ruined, what one town had seized from another, and that he might cause town to know its boundary with town, their boundary-stones being secured like heaven and their waters being made known according to what was in the writings and verified according to what was in antiquity, through the greatness of his love of Right."¹ The nomes were expected to provide militia, fleets and supplies for enterprises at home and abroad.²

54.6 For the distribution of land to the army, see below ch. 73.7.

CHAPTER 55

55.1 The occupation of Lower Nubia was begun during the co-regency of Amenemhet I and Senwosret I. By the ninth year of the co-regency, according to the inscription of Korosko, the conquered area extended as far as Korosko and possibly further.³ In his eighteenth year Senwosret I completed the occupation of Lower Nubia and established some control in the area between the second and third cataracts. The mines and quarries of Nubia were at once exploited, and it became the gold-producing country *par excellence*, in addition to providing rare animals, ebony and ivory.

The foundations of Egyptian empire in Nubia had now been laid, but it was left to Senwosret III to consolidate Egypt's hold on the country. Herodotus, II, 110 says that Sesostris was the only Egyptian king to rule Ethiopia, but it is probable that whereas Senwosret I was the first to conquer the country, Senwosret III was the first actually to rule it.

55.2 Ships were used for purposes of war at least as early as the Old Kingdom, and possibly in the predynastic period. In support of the earlier date is a painting from a tomb at Hierakonpolis de-

¹ Breasted, *AR*, I, 625.

² Faulkner, "Egyptian Military Organization", *JEA*, XXXIX, 1953, 32-47.

³ Breasted, *AR*, I, 472f. See also Gardiner, *Egypt of the Pharaohs*, p. 135f.; Hayes, "The Middle Kingdom in Egypt", *CAH*², p. 38f., 42, 45f.; Drioton-Vandier, *L'Égypte* (4th ed.), p. 256f.; Säve-Söderbergh, *Ägypten und Nubien*, p. 63-116.

picting two different types of ship engaged in conflict.¹ It seems likely that ships capable of going to sea were used both for trade and for war, according to necessity, and the question is discussed by R. O. Faulkner, "Egyptian Sea-going Ships", *JEA*, XXVI, 1940, 3-9.

In the Vth Dyn., for the first time in Egyptian history, King Sahurē transported his troops by ship to the Syrian coast. Clearly the ships employed for this purpose followed the usual pattern of Egyptian ships, and although used for purposes of war, cannot accurately be termed "warships." Ships, however, definitely constructed as warships took part in a great sea battle in the reign of Ramesses III. Their shape differs so greatly from that of their fore-runners that Faulkner sees in them foreign influence. These ships possessed bulwarks to protect the rowers, while the fighting-men apparently stood on raised gangways. The sail and its gear was kept out of the way of the soldiers, and all manoeuvring in battle was by oar. At each end of the ship was a square structure occupied by archers.

These ships, departing as they did from the traditional structure, must be what Diodorus has in mind, although he ascribes to them far too early a date.²

55.2 The conquest of the world by Sesoösis is pure fiction. The later Asiatic campaigns of Ramesses II must have been confused with the Nubian campaigns of the XIIth Dyn., and became exaggerated out of all proportion. Such Asiatic campaigns were not contemplated until the New Kingdom, and it was for this reason that Sesostris was originally ascribed to a later date.³

There is, however, evidence for the increasingly important role played by Egypt in the culture, commerce and politics of Western Asia at this time. There are indications of such diplomatic relations in the story of Sinuhe,⁴ in that the Syrian prince could take the initiative in diplomatic correspondence with the new king. Expan-

¹ Quibell and Green, *Hierakonpolis*, II, pl. LXXVII; Case and Payne, "The Decorated Tomb at Hierakonpolis", *JEA*, XLVIII, 1962, 5-18.

² See also Boreux, *Études de nautique égyptienne*.

³ See above ch. 53.

⁴ Léfèbvre, *Romans et contes égyptiens*.

sion in Asia at that date appears to have been purely pacific with no question of war: by the time of the writing of Sinuhe the incursions of the bedouin would have been forgotten, though, as has been said, Senwosret III did campaign in Samaria.¹ Objects dating from the XIIth Dyn. have been discovered still further north, but in the absence of written evidence their significance can only be conjectured. Asiatic slaves, however, are increasingly mentioned on stelae and in papyri, although it is impossible to say with any certainty whether or not they are prisoners of war.²

55.4 The Colchi seem to have been generally accepted as Egyptian colonists amongst Classical authors.³ Herodotus, II, 104 describes them as *μελάγχροες* and *οὐλότριχες*, suggesting an African origin; and in fact English, "Cushites, Colchians and Khazars", *JNES*, XVIII, 1959, 49-53, records the existence of a small negro community near Sukhumi in Abkhazia. This may well be the only negro community in the Old World outside Africa and the coastlands of the Indian Ocean. Obviously they cannot be the descendants of Sesostri's army, since none of the XIIth Dyn. kings penetrated to this area, but their origins remain obscure.

The river Tanais and Lake Maeotis are the Don and the Sea of Azov. Colchis, however, is generally thought to have been in the Caucasus.

55.5 For circumcision, see above ch. 28.3.

55.7 There is some confusion between the stelae and statues of the accounts of Herodotus and Diodorus. Herodotus, II, 102 talks of the erection of stelae recording the bravery or cowardice of those conquered by Sesostri; and in II, 106 he mentions two reliefs (*ἐγγέλυπται*) of Sesostri, bearing the inscription: *Ἐγὼ τήνδε τὴν χώραν ὥμοισι τοῖσι ἐμοῖσι ἐκτησάμην*. These are the famous rock sculptures at Karabel on Mount Sipylus, and are not Egyptian.⁴ Diodorus, however, distinguishes between stelae bearing a similar

¹ See above ch. 53.5.

² Hayes, *A Papyrus of the Late Middle Kingdom in the Brooklyn Museum*, p. 99.

³ See above p. 11 and 118.

⁴ See Cook, *Türk Arkeoloji Dergisi*, VI, 2; Bittel, *Archiv für Orientalforschung*, XIII, 1939-41, 181ff.

inscription to that given by Herodotus and recording the bravery or cowardice of his victims;¹ and statues, not reliefs, erected in unspecified places.

55.7 For βασιλεὺς βασιλέων and its Egyptian equivalent see above ch. 47.4.

55.8 Iversen, *The Myth of Egypt and its Hieroglyphs*, p. 149, n. 16, believes this story to be based on a misunderstanding of the Egyptian use of determinatives. The same account is given by both Herodotus, II, 102 and Manetho, frg. 34 from Syncellus ap. Africanus: πανταχόσε μνημόσυνα ἐγείρας τῆς τῶν ἐθνῶν σχέσεως, ἐπὶ μὲν τοῖς γενναίοις ἀνδρῶν, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖς ἀγενέσι γυναικῶν μόρια ταῖς στήλαις ἐγχάρασσων, ὥς ὑπὸ Αἰγυπτίων μετὰ Ὑοσιριν πρῶτον νομισθῆναι. The story must have arisen at a time when the knowledge of hieroglyphs was beginning to be lost, though in that case one might expect Manetho, a priest who presumably had some understanding of the Egyptian language, to have suspected the truth.

A stele has been discovered, erected at Semna by Senwosret III, which is notable for its contempt of the conquered Nubians, and which may perhaps be compared with the stelae described in this passage.²

55.9 For the height of Sesostriis, see Lepsius, "Der Sesostriis-Herakles Korperlänge", *ZÄS*, IX, 1871, 52-56; Herodotus, II, 106 says that the figures of Sesostriis were πέμπτης σπιθαμῆς in height. Lepsius proves that this is four cubits plus one σπιθαμή, and believes that all the later estimates of Sesostriis' height are drawn from Herodotus' account. Thus Manetho has four cubits, three palms and two fingers; Diodorus has four cubits, four palms; and Herodorus Ponticus³ gives the height of Herakles as four cubits, one foot—an estimate which in Lepsius' view is also based on Herodotus' account of Sesostriis.

But Lepsius' theory is fraught with difficulties, which seem mainly to revolve round the question of whether it is the Egyptian or

¹ Posener, "A propos de la stèle de Bentresh", *BIFAO*, XXXIV, 1934, 80f., compares these stelae with those of Darius according to Herod., IV, 87.

² *Ägyptische Inschriften aus den Königlichen Museen zu Berlin*, I, 257.

³ Schol. Pindar I, IV, 87.

Greek system of measurement to which each of the authors refers. The Greek cubit was divided into six palms, as was the early small Egyptian cubit. But at the same time as the latter, there also existed an Egyptian royal cubit of seven palms. And when in the Saite period this became the standard Egyptian cubit, it was re-divided into six new palms. But since both the Greek cubit and the Saite cubit were measured from elbow to medius, and since both were divided into 6 palms, it can be seen that the Greek cubit corresponds to the Saite cubit rather than to the earlier small cubit which was measured from elbow to thumb.¹

However, Lepsius' suggestion is that since Herodotus' *πιθαμή* (3 palms) is half a Greek or half a small Egyptian cubit,² and the $3\frac{1}{2}$ palms of Manetho is half an original royal cubit, Herodotus must be referring to the small Egyptian cubit, Manetho to the royal cubit, retaining the subdivisions of the earlier royal cubit: thus 3 small palms become $3\frac{1}{2}$ small palms instead of 3 new palms. But this explanation is not entirely satisfactory: whether Herodotus is referring to the original small cubit, or to the Greek or Saite cubit,³ it is extremely unlikely that Manetho would have translated *πιθαμή* into terms of the earlier royal cubit.⁴ More particularly, one cannot but feel that it is improbable that Manetho, who had little respect for Herodotus, should have made use of him at all. It is far more likely that he came to his own conclusions in this matter.

It is still more difficult to understand how or why both Herodotus and Diodorus should have translated the *πιθαμή* of Herodotus into one whole foot or four palms. Lepsius suggests that Herodorus converted Herodotus' estimate into a round figure, and Diodorus may

¹ See further below ch. 98.

² Or, indeed, half a Saite cubit of six new palms.

³ The use of the Greek term *πιθαμή* might suggest that it is the Greek cubit he had in mind. But as has been seen, this was identical with the Saite cubit, which was in any case in use in Egypt well before the time of Herodotus. Moreover, Michaelis, "The Metrological Relief at Oxford", *JHS*, IV, 1883, 335-350, has proved that Herodotus elsewhere (II, 168) refers to the Egyptian royal cubit, which he says is equal to the Samian.

⁴ But one cannot be dogmatic on this point: there was a deliberate revival of archaic cultural traditions in the XXVIth Dyn. (see Iversen, *Canon and Proportions in Egyptian Art*, p. 40, 66f.), and it is not entirely inconceivable that Manetho, although at a much later date, should refer to an earlier metrological system.

simply have followed suit. But this seems doubtful: there would in that case be no reason for Herodorus to pay any attention whatever to Herodotus' figures: he may simply have estimated the heroic stature to have exceeded that of a mere mortal by a foot, which is after all a reasonable "round figure." And presumably Diodorus is following the same tradition. There is even a remote possibility that the estimates of Herodorus and Diodorus are founded in Egyptian metrology: if the height of a man is taken to be 4 cubits or 24 palms, the height of a legendary hero or king might well be reckoned as 4 royal cubits or 28 palms on the pre-Saite canon, a height which would exceed that of an ordinary man by 4 palms, or in Greek terms, a foot.¹

All in all, the difficulties of Lepsius' suggestion, that all the estimates of heroic stature are based on Herodotus, are such as to lead one to suppose that this cannot be the case, and that the varying amounts by which the stature of these giants is said to surpass that of other men are the independent estimates of the different authors.² Certainly, although the historical section of Diodorus owes much to Herodotus in origin, there seems to be no means by which the estimates of these two authors can be reconciled.

CHAPTER 56

56.1 With Sesoösis' motives, a desire for glory and everlasting fame, compare those attributed to Herakles (ch. 2.4) and to Osiris (ch. 17.1).

56.2 There are numerous sites in Egypt containing buildings or monuments of Ramesses II, and there is hardly any temple which

¹ Technically speaking, the term "foot" is not used in the Egyptian metrological system. The unit it represents is $\frac{2}{3}$ cubit, the distance from elbow to wrist, and it is indeed the length of the human foot in relation to the cubit. In the Saite canon, this old $\frac{2}{3}$ cubit measure was represented by $3\frac{1}{2}$ new palms—thus it is possible to connect Manetho's $3\frac{1}{2}$ palms with the foot of Herodorus, if one assumes that he translated $\pi\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ into Egyptian terms; while Diodorus accepted it in its Greek usage, representing 4 palms or $\frac{2}{3}$ cubit. (For the problems presented by the "foot", see Michaelis, *op. cit.*, 337ff., and Iversen, *MDAIK*, XV, 142f.)

² Cf. e.g. the eighth king of Manetho's IIInd Dyn., who is said to have been five cubits, three palms tall.

has not been embellished by him. But Senwosret I was also responsible for a considerable amount of building in Egypt, and this element of the tradition may equally well stem from the XIIth Dyn. as from the Ramessid era.¹ The use of captives for such work is understandable, and was common practice in the Middle and New Kingdoms.

56.3 For Babylon see Gauthier, *Dictionnaire Géographique*, II, 110, per Hapi, and Gardiner, *Ancient Egyptian Onomastica*, II, p. 131*f., and 143*ff. The town of *Pr-Ḥꜥy* is closely connected with *Ḥr-ḥꜥ*, which may well be Old Cairo, and the two are frequently mentioned together. Spiegelberg, quoting Sethe, in *Randglossen*, p. 39, gives the etymology of Babylon as P(er)-hapu-l-on, "The House of Hapy of On (Heliopolis)." It is probable that the Greeks called the place Babylon because of the assonance of an Egyptian place-name, and this is the most plausible suggestion.² The name occurs constantly in the Greek papyri until Byzantine times, when it was used interchangeably with Fostat, the other term for Old Cairo.³

That the place was established by captives from Babylonia seems highly improbable.⁴ The story probably arose from the similarity in the names. It is remotely possible that Diodorus' reference to warfare between the Egyptians and captive Babylonians reflects a mythological event: *Ḥr-ḥꜥ* is mentioned (though not with absolute certainty) as the site of a battle between Horus and Seth.⁵

56.4 For the city of Troy, see Gauthier, *Dictionnaire Géographique*, VI, 97, Draou; and Gardiner, *Ancient Egyptian Onomastica*, II, p. 126*, *Trꜥw*. This is the modern Tura, situated about ten kilometres by river up-stream from Old Cairo, and famous for its limestone quarries. The original form of the name was *r-ꜥw*, but the

¹ See Sethe, *Sesostris*, p. 21f.; Vandier, *Manuel d'archéologie égyptienne*, II, 2 (Paris, 1955), p. 1061, s.v. Sesostris.

² But see below ch. 85.2 for the difficulties involved.

³ Bell, *Papyrus London*, IV, p. XVIII.

⁴ Cf. Strabo XVII 1.30.

⁵ Pyr. 1350, "Get back, great Black One! Crawl away into *Ḥr-ḥꜥ*, into that place where they crawled." Cf. P. Sallier, IV recto 2, 8ff.

form with the initial dental (the definite article) is attested by the Onomasticon of Amenope, proving that the name Τροία was suggested to the Greeks by the native name.¹

A similar version of the origin of the name is to be found in Strabo, XVII, 1.34, who, however, simply mentions that the captive Trojans settled there. That Menelaus visited Egypt on his journey from Troy is attested by *Od.*, IX.

56.5 Ctesias of Cnidus was Diodorus' source for much of Book II. He spent some years at the court of the Persian Artaxerxes Mnemon as physician, and returned to Greece after about 390 B.C. He wrote an untrustworthy history of Persia in twenty-three books, the first six dealing with Assyrian and Median history.

For Semiramis see Diodorus, II, 4ff., and for her Egyptian campaign, II, 14. The legend of Semiramis may be compared with that of Sesostris in that she was believed to have conquered all Asia (excluding India), to have founded Babylon etc., and was generally credited with the deeds of other kings. She is probably that Sammu-ramat, mother of Adad-nirari III, who ruled as regent in Assyria 811-808 B.C.²

CHAPTER 57

57.1 There is definite evidence of irrigational work on a large scale during the XIIth Dyn. Amenemhet I is recorded as having established towns' water-supplies,³ and Amenemhet III was responsible for extensive land reclamation and flood control in the Fayûm area,⁴ although this was probably begun under Senwosret II. This does seem to reflect the relatively secure position of Egypt at this time, both internally and externally. In addition it is probable that there was a certain amount of canalisation of the first cataract by Senwosret III, following his conquest of Nubia. However, nothing

¹ See also Harris, *Lexicographical Studies in Ancient Egyptian Minerals*, p. 73f.; P. Anastasi, II, 8.3 (Caminos, *Late-Egyptian Miscellanies*, p. 51 and note on p. 55).

² Smith, *CAH*, III, (1925), 27; Meissner, *Babylonien und Assyrien*, I, 38.

³ See above ch. 54.3.

⁴ See above ch. 51.

specific is known about the canal building activities of the Senwosrets (or of Ramesses II, for that matter).

57.4 No trace of the wall built by Sesostris has been discovered, but there are indisputable references to it in Egyptian texts. In the story of Sinuhe there is a reference to the "Wall of the Prince": "J'atteignis les Murs du Prince qui ont été construite pour repousser les Bédouins et pour écraser les coureurs des Sables."¹ Its builder is named as Amenemhet I. The building of the wall is prophesied in P. Petersburg, III, 6B recto,² where the future builder is called Ameny, which must presumably be Amenemhet I.

For a detailed discussion of the date, site and nature of the wall, see Posener, *Littérature et Politique dans l'Égypte de la XIIe Dynastie*, *passim*, and particularly p. 24-26, 54-57. Diodorus records that the wall ran from Pelusium to Heliopolis. Gauthier, *Dictionnaire Géographique*, I, 82 describes it as a "long mur de défense qui barrait l'isthme de Suez du Nord au Sud"; while Kuthmann, *Die Ostgrenze Ägyptens*, p. 34 concludes that the wall was near Tell el-Retâba, near the mouth of the Wadi Tumilat. But as Posener points out, the wall was apparently not a continuous barrier since Sinuhe appears to pass it without having to climb it.

57.5 The cedar wood ship plated with gold and silver seems to be a reference to a river-bark of Amon-rē.³ There was in fact more than one bark of Amūn at Thebes, and it is impossible to tell exactly which of them Diodorus has in mind. One such bark, described by Foucart,⁴ was made of the most precious wood, and its sides were covered with gold leaf. Diodorus' estimate of its length appears exaggerated: the longest bark for which there is evidence is 130 cubits.

57.5 There is a red granite obelisk of Thutmose III, now in Istanbul, which may be one of the pair mentioned by Diodorus. Its original site is uncertain, but it is believed to have stood before

¹ Léfèbvre, *Romans et contes égyptiens*, p. 7.

² Gardiner, "New Literary Works from Ancient Egypt", *JEA*, I, 1914, 100-106.

³ For the river-barks of the various gods and their use, see further below ch. 97.

⁴ "Un temple flottant, le vaisseau d'or d'Amon-Ra", in *Monuments et Mémoires* (Piot), XXV: cf. also the Palermo Stone Face A, 16, 1. 1.4.

the seventh pylon of the temple of Amūn at Karnak.¹ λίθος σκληρός may perhaps be a translation of the Egyptian term *mꜣt rwḏt*, "hard granite." For a discussion of the significance of the term, see Harris, *Lexicographical Studies*, p. 73f.

57.5 Near the south pylon of the Temple of Ptah there is a limestone colossus of Ramesses II, which appears originally to have been about forty-two feet high (the thirty cubits of Diodorus' estimate). Nearby used to stand a red granite colossus of Ramesses II with figures of Prince Merneptah and Princess Bent'anta. This is now in Cairo.² These statues Herodotus, II, 121, rightly attributes to Rhampsinitus, indicating that the confusion between Sesostris and Ramesses II increased in the intervening period between Herodotus and Diodorus.

57.6 Herodotus, II, 107 records that Sesostris saved himself by sacrificing two of his sons for use as a bridge through the flames. Spiegelberg, *The Credibility of Herodotus' Account of Egypt*, p. 25 suggests that this was a dragoman's tale based on representations of a triumphant king with his feet placed on two heads, Negro and Syrian (*op. cit.* pl. I).

There is no evidence of the separate plot against Senwosret I, but the beginning of the story of Sinuhe implies that the plot against Amenemhet I was intended to eliminate also the co-regent Senwosret.

Manetho, in Josephus, *Contra Apionem*, I, 15, 16, chs. 98-105, tells a similar story of a king called Sethos or Ramesses, who must be the Sesostris of Herodotus and Diodorus.

CHAPTER 58

58.2 There is absolutely no evidence that foreign kings were forced by Sesostris to draw his chariot in place of horses.³ Malaise,

¹ Porter and Moss, *Topographical Bibliography*, II, p. 55; VII, p. 400. See also Gorringer, *Egyptian Obelisks*, p. 124-126, pl. XLII; Bruns, *Der Obelisk und seine Basis auf dem Hippodrom zu Konstantinopel*.

² Porter and Moss, *op. cit.*, III, p. 219.

³ Cf. Lucan, *Pharsalia*, X, 276f.: *Venit ad occasus mundique extrema Sesostris et Pharios currus regum cervicibus egit.*

in *Chron. d'Ég.*, XLI, 1966, 244ff. says, "La tradition suivant laquelle Sesostris attelait à son char les rois vaincus peut s'expliquer par l'interprétation détournée à son avantage, de bas-reliefs égyptiens du Nouvel Empire qui illustrent une coutume généralisée par les pharaons de cette époque." But he cites no references for such reliefs, and it is difficult to know what he has in mind. The story might perhaps be based on a garbled misinterpretation of reliefs showing vast statues on sledges being drawn by numbers of workers.

In the XIIth Dyn. the chariot was completely unknown: the horse first became common during the New Kingdom, but even in the XVIIIth Dyn. it was a valuable object of tribute. It seems in fact to have been introduced by the Hyksos.¹

58.3 In the forty-third year of his reign Senwosret I associated his son Amenemhet II with himself as co-regent. Presumably Diodorus has taken this year as the last year of his reign, discounting also the first ten years when Senwosret was co-regent with his father Amenemhet I.

There is no evidence for the story that Sesostris became blind and committed suicide. However, Wainwright, *The Sky Religion in Egypt*, sees in this, and in Sesostris' life as a whole, the pattern of the rain-maker's life. Thus in the fire sequence,² he sees an attempt to immolate the king, which Sesostris avoids (according to Herodotus, by sacrificing his sons). His subsequent suicide is, in Wainwright's view, motivated by his acceptance of the king's responsibility for his people, dating back to the time before the occupation of the Nile Valley when it was the duty of the king in Libya to ensure rain for the crops by self-sacrifice. The theory is interesting, but must be treated with caution.

58.4 With this story of Darius in Memphis, compare the version given by Herodotus, II, 110. Braun, *History and Romance in Graeco-*

¹ Gardiner, "The Defeat of the Hyksos by Kamose", *JEA*, III, 1916, 107; for the earliest representation of a horse see C. Desroches-Noblecourt, "Un petit monument commémoratif du Roi Athlète", *Rev. d'Ég.*, VII, 1950, 43. But Emery has discovered a horse-burial at Buhen allegedly of the M.K. (*Egypt Exploration Society Report*, 1958, p. 6).

² See above ch. 57, 6-8.

Oriental Literature, p. 15, sees in this a notable instance of the Egyptians' regard for Sesostris.

CHAPTER 59

59.1 According to Sethe, "Sesostris", *Untersuchungen*, II, since Sesoösis is Senwosret I, his son must be Amenemhet II. This may be confirmed by Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, XXXVI, 74, who mentions "*Nencoreus, Sesosidis filius.*" Nencoreus must come from *Nb-k3w-re*, the name of Amenemhet II. In this case προσηγوریαν presumably refers to a title or similar appellation, rather than to a name itself, and since Herodotus calls him Pheron, the title is probably *pr-3* (hence Pharaoh). This, meaning "Great House", was originally only one way of referring to the royal palace; but in the reign of Thutmose III (XVIIIth Dyn.) it began to be used for the king himself.¹

59.2 As has been seen, Wainwright, *The Sky Religion in Egypt*, sees blindness as an affliction of rain-makers,² and he compares this and the holocaust of the unfaithful women with similar elements in the story of Sesostris. In addition the son of Sesoosis apparently attempted to control the elements by casting his javelin into the river: certain African tribes are said to strike the ground with a lance before crossing a ford, and sacred spears play a part in rain ceremonies of the Upper Nile.

59.3 For the use of urine as a cure for blindness see *Wb. Drog.*, VI, p. 235-7, under *mwyf*. Compare also Cato, *De Agr.*, CLVII, 10.

59.3 Burning as a punishment for adultery is confirmed by P. Westcar:³ "Ensuite la Majesté du roi Nebka fit conduire la femme d'Oubaoné sur un terrain au nord du palais, la fit brûler, (puis) ses cendres furent jetées au fleuve." See also below ch. 78.4.

59.3 The village where the unfaithful women were burnt alive, which Diodorus says was called ἱερὰν βῶλον, is called by Herodotus, II, III, ἐρυθρή βῶλος. The site so far has not been identified with

¹ Gardiner, *Ancient Egyptian Onomastica*, II, p. 52*.

² See above ch. 58.3.

³ Trans. Lefébvre, *Romans et contes égyptiens*, p. 77.

certainty, but it may be Gebel el-Ahmar, east of Cairo.¹ The difference in the names recorded by the two Classical authors might well be the result of confused translations of an Egyptian name: the Egyptian for "holy" is *ḏsr*, for "red" *dšr*, and by late times the difference in pronunciation between these two words would be minimal.²

59.4 There is still one obelisk standing in Heliopolis, that of Senwosret I. Its partner stood until c. A.D. 1160.³ Diodorus' estimate of its height is wildly exaggerated. It is in fact sixty-six feet high, but a traveller of the XIIth century A.D., Abd el-Latif, also reckoned its height as one hundred cubits.⁴

CHAPTER 60

60.1f. The identities of the Amasis and Actisanes mentioned in this chapter cannot be determined with any degree of certainty. The name Actisanes occurs nowhere else in Classical literature, and the main difficulty arises from Diodorus' statement that Actisanes was an Ethiopian, and that he defeated the Egyptian King Amasis. The only Ethiopian kings recorded are those of the XXVth Dyn. and Wiedemann, *Ägyptische Geschichte*, p. 582, n. 1, therefore suggests that Actisanes is to be identified with Shabaka.⁵ But this in turn raises the problem of the identity of Amasis who ought in that case to be a double of Bocchoris, although it is difficult to see how that could be the case. On the other hand, Diodorus' Amasis cannot be the king of that name of the XXVIth Dyn. who ruled just before the Persian conquest,⁶ but ought rather to be the first king of the XVIIIth Dyn., Ahmose. But it then becomes impossible to identify Actisanes with any of his successors.

¹ Ball, *Egypt in the Classical Geographers*, p. 17.

² Gauthier, *Dictionnaire Géographique*, IV, p. 142, records a place *ḥwt dšr*, and IV, p. 144 *ḥwt ḏswt*: however neither of these appear to be the site in question.

³ Porter and Moss, *Topographical Bibliography*, IV, p. 60.

⁴ Gorringer, *Egyptian Obelisks*, p. 123f.

⁵ See Pietschman, in *RE*, I, 1216.

⁶ Discussed below by Diodorus, ch. 68.

60.5 Rhinocolura is the modern El-Arish, to the east of Lake Serbonis, and was originally an Egyptian penal settlement.¹ The practice of severing the nose in punishment appears to have been fairly common in Egypt, as indeed it was until quite recently throughout much of the Middle East. Cf. Strabo, XVI, 2.31: εἴτα 'Ρινοκόλουρα ἀπὸ τῶν εἰδωκισμένων ἐκεῖ τὸ παλαιὸν ἀνθρώπων ἡκρωτηριασμένων τὰς ῥίνας οὕτω καλουμένη· τῶν γὰρ Αἰθιοπῶν τις ἐπελθὼν ἐπὶ τὴν Αἴγυπτον, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀναιρεῖν τοὺς κακούργους ἀποτέμνων τὰς ῥίνας ἐνταῦθα κατῴκιζεν, ὥς οὐκ ἂν ἔτι τολμήσοντας κακουργεῖν διὰ τὴν αἰσχύνην τῆς ὀψεως.

CHAPTER 61

61.1 Vergote, "Le roi Moiris-Mares", *ZĀS*, LXXXVII, 1962, 66-76, has proved that both the forms Mendes and Marrus developed from Nema'rē, one of the names of Amenemhet III,² the builder of the Egyptian labyrinth.³

61.3 For the significance of labyrinths and maze patterns in general, see in particular Jackson Knight, *Vergil, Epic and Anthropology*, part 2 passim. Maze patterns were made and used in Egypt about a thousand years earlier than elsewhere. Their main purpose was exclusion, and they are thus found in forts, graves and temples. In so far as Diodorus implies that the Egyptian labyrinth was earlier than the Cretan,⁴ he is probably correct. But it cannot necessarily be maintained that the Cretan labyrinth owes anything to Egyptian influence. As Jackson Knight points out, the maze idea may have originated independently in a number of places.⁵

There is still some dispute about the nature and identity of the original Cretan labyrinth; it now seems likely that it is not to be identified with the palace at Knossos, but rather with a cave system, as indeed later authors believed.⁶ However, it is obvious

¹ See Beer, in *RE*, I, A, 1, 841f.; Kees, *Ancient Egypt*, p. 194.

² See also ch. 51.5.

³ See below ch. 66.

⁴ For the Cretan labyrinth, see Herod., II, 148; Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, XXXVI, 84-5.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 229.

⁶ Knight, *op. cit.*, p. 247ff., sees the connection between the natural cave

that what Diodorus, in common with most of the earlier Classical writers on the subject, had in mind is not a natural cave formation, but a human construction which was attributed to Daedalus, and in which it was believed that the Minotaur was imprisoned. Thus the "Labyrinth", at least as far as the earlier Classical authors are concerned, must be identified with some part of the palace at Knossos.

Whatever it was, the "Labyrinth" was no longer visible to the Classical authors: Diodorus says that it had entirely disappeared, and Pliny, XXXVI, 90, says explicitly that no traces of it had survived.

CHAPTER 62

62.1f. The identity of the Egyptian king called by the Greeks Proteus remains uncertain. Diodorus is the first to attribute to him the Egyptian name Cetes, a form which appears to bear no relation to the known name of any Egyptian king. It is, however, very likely that Cetes is the Greek form of the Egyptian *ḥṣty*- "chieftain", or "local prince",¹ particularly as Diodorus specifically says that this king was of obscure origin, i.e. he was not a member of the ruling dynasty.²

In Homer Proteus appears as an old man of the sea, but even here he is called Αἰγύπτιος, and is said to live on the island of Pharos.³ In Herodotus, II, 112, he appears for the first time as a king, and therefore mortal, and here he is said to live in Memphis.⁴ In Euripides, *Helen*, Proteus appears as king, not δαίμων, of Pharos; while Vergil⁵ and Ovid⁶ both associate Proteus with Carpathus, an or rock labyrinth, the palace or tomb, and the labyrinthine dance, as one of the "principle of exclusion and conditional penetration."

¹ The main argument against this theory is that the Egyptian *ḥ* usually disappears in Greek (cf. *Hwt-Hr*—"Aἰὺρ"), though it is retained in Coptic as **ϣ** (*Wb.*, III, 25f.). There is no instance of *ḥ* becoming *κ*, which one might expect rather to come from Egyptian *ḥ*, *ḥ* or perhaps *ḥ*. But there is e.g. the anomalous instance of Greek *χαμψα* from Egyptian *msh*, Coptic **Ⲭⲥⲁϣ**.

² For the possible identity of Cetes see below. It may be of interest to note that the word *ḥṣty*- is written , i.e. with the forepart of a lion, cf. below 62.4.

³ *Od.*, IV, 385.

⁴ See How and Wells, *Commentary on Herodotus*, I, p. 223.

⁵ *Georg.*, IV, 387.

⁶ *Am.*, II, 15, 10.

island between Crete and Rhodes, probably used to indicate roughly the same area of the Mediterranean as Homer. Elsewhere, Proteus appears to have been associated with Thrace, and legends portray him as coming from Thrace to Egypt. Spiegelberg, "Der ägypter König Proteus", *BIFAO*, XXX, 1930, 103-106, suggests that the confusion between the Greek and Egyptian Proteus arose when the Greeks saw statues of kings with the attributes of the Nile-god, and related them to their own Proteus. But this is not entirely convincing, as Proteus appears never to have been seen as a fruitful river god. Wiedemann, *Herodots zweites Buch*, p. 432, suggests that the Proteus of Herodotus' account was not the Greek figure, but an unidentified Egyptian who was compared with him. This explanation is made the more plausible by the similarity between the Greek name Proteus, and the Egyptian title *p3-rwty*.¹

Roscher² believes that the key to the conversion of Proteus into an Egyptian king lies in the shrine of the Stranger Aphrodite. This, according to Herodotus, II, 112f., lay in a temple precinct at Memphis. The precinct was surrounded by the Phoenicians of Tyre, and the whole place was known as the "Camp of the Tyrians". At the same time Herodotus claims to have heard from the Egyptian priests the story that the abducted Helen was detained in Egypt by Proteus, and prevented from reaching Troy. As a result, Herodotus concluded that the Stranger Aphrodite was in fact Helen. From the position of the shrine of Aphrodite in the "Camp of the Tyrians", it is clear that the Phoenician goddess of love was intended; but it is possible that under Greek influence she became explained as Helen; and Proteus, who according to Homer received the wandering Menelaus, now became the Egyptian king who received Helen.³

¹ The title *p3-rwty*, "high doors" (of temple or palace), is mentioned by Mallet, *Les premiers établissements grecs en Égypte*, p. 401, n. 3, as "un des nombreux titres donnés aux souverains égyptiens." For its use as a title, see Brugsch, *Hierogl.-Demotisch Wörterbuch*, III, p. 852, and P. Anastasi, I, 28.7, where it is applied to the king. Lauth, *Ägyptische Chronologie*, p. 181f., was the first to identify this title with the name Proteus. See also Maspero, "Fragments d'une commentaire sur Herodote II", *Bibl. Eg.*, VII, p. 345ff.

² III, p. 3172ff.

³ For the late cult of Helen in Egypt, see von Bissing, "Il culto dei Dioscuri in Egitto", *Aegyptus*, XXXIII, 1953, 347-357.

Nevertheless, this does not explain all aspects of the myth of Proteus and his confusion with an Egyptian king.

Cook, *Zeus*, I, p. 496, suggests that Proteus was famed for changing his shape because the king and queen in Egypt figured as god and goddess in certain rites, while masked men and women played the parts of various animal-headed deities. He adduces this in evidence of his theory that the minotaur was no more than a man in a bull's costume; and indeed his explanation approaches Diodorus' attempt to rationalize the myth.

Cook further suggests that Proteus or Cetes was the first king of the XXth Dyn., Setnakhte, father of Ramesses III. This is presumably based on the assumption that the Remphis of Diodorus and the Rhampsinitus of Herodotus are to be identified with Ramesses III. This in turn is based on the identification, no longer valid, of Ramesses II and Sesostris.¹ However, the fact that Setnakhte was of obscure origin may be a point in his favour. On the other hand, if Remphis can be identified with Ramesses II,² then Proteus/Cetes may be identified either with Haremhab, the founder of the XIXth Dyn., and a man of non-royal blood;³ or possibly with Ramesses I, a man of the Delta, raised by Haremhab to the rank of vizir, later to become his successor. An additional point in favour of the first identification is that Haremhab is believed to have made Memphis his capital after his coronation at Thebes,⁴ and Herodotus, II, 112, refers to Proteus as "a man of Memphis." Furthermore, although neither Haremhab nor Ramesses I was succeeded immediately by Ramesses II, as Diodorus says, it can be accepted without difficulty that Ramesses II might be confused with Ramesses I who did in fact succeed Haremhab.⁵

62.4 The snake, or sacred uraeus, the serpent of the north, is the creature most commonly portrayed on headwear, and examples of statues of kings with the uraeus attached to their foreheads are

¹ See above ch. 53, introduction.

² See below.

³ Gardiner, *Egypt of the Pharaohs*, p. 242ff.

⁴ Gardiner, *op. cit.*, p. 244.

⁵ Ramesses I was succeeded by Sety I, and only after him by Ramesses II, so that an identification of Proteus with Ramesses I leaves the omission of Sety I completely unaccounted for.

numerous. The king may also be depicted with a hawk or vulture on or near his head,¹ or he may appear in part as a falcon.²

The lion was a symbol of the king's strength, as was the bull,³ and the king might be represented with a lion's tail, or in the Sed festival with a bull's tail. Moreover the horns of a cow or ram are shown in some forms of the royal crown.⁴

62.5 Remphis is the Rhampsinitus of Herodotus, II, 121ff., originally identified with Ramesses III on the assumption that Sesostris was Ramesses II.⁵ With the acceptance of Sethe's explanation of the identity of Sesostris,⁶ this argument becomes invalid, and Remphis may equally well be Ramesses II. What Herodotus says of Rhampsinitus could as well apply to Ramesses II as to Ramesses III, as it is impossible to know which of them had the greater reputation for wealth. The amount of riches given to the gods in the reign of Ramesses III⁷ does not necessarily indicate his particular wealth, because there are no equivalent lists for other reigns with which to compare it.

The theory that Remphis was really Ramesses II is supported by the fact that Herodotus, II, 121, records that Rhampsinitus erected two statues of himself in the western forecourt of the temple of Ptah; there are in fact two colossi of Ramesses II near the south propylon of the temple, which Diodorus wrongly ascribes to Sesostris.⁸ On the other hand, Diodorus' assertion that Remphis οὔτε εἰς ἀναθήματα θεῶν οὔτ' εἰς εὐεργεσίαν ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲν ἀνήλωσε hardly agrees with what is known of Ramesses II: there are few temples or other buildings in Egypt upon which Ramesses II has not left some record of his reign. In addition Ramesses II appears earlier in the book under the name Osymandyas, although this does not pre-

¹ See e.g. Carter, *The Tomb of Tut-Ankh-Amen*, II, p. 83 where Tutankhamūn is shown wearing both the uraeus and the Nekhebet vulture.

² Brunner, *ZAS*, LXXXIII, 1958, 74f.; LXXXVII, 1962, 76f.; Krieger, *Rev. d'Ég.*, XII, 1960, 37-58.

³ De Wit, *Le rôle et le sens du lion*, p. 16-34 and 400-403.

⁴ Abubakr, *Untersuchungen über die altägyptischen Krönen*, p. 7ff., 62ff.

⁵ See Lauth, *Ägyptische Chronologie*, p. 181f.

⁶ See above ch. 53, introduction.

⁷ Recorded in P. Harris; see Breasted, *AR*, IV, 151-152, for a translation and analysis.

⁸ See above ch. 57.5.

clude the possibility of Diodorus' referring to the same king later under a different name, the two separate names coming from the king's prenomen and nomen.

CHAPTER 63

63.1 The date of the supposed king Nileus can be roughly estimated from Schol. Apoll. Rhod., IV, 276: Δικαίαρχος δὲ ἐν α' μετὰ τὸν Ἰσιδος καὶ Ὀσίριδος Ὡρον βασιλέα γεγονέναι Σεσογχώσιν· γίνεται δὲ ἀπὸ Σεσογχώσεως ἐπὶ τὴν Νείλου βασιλείαν ἔτη, βφ', <ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς Νείλου βασιλείας ἐπὶ τὴν Ἰλίου ἄλωσιν ζ', > ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς Ἰλίου ἄλώσεως ἐπὶ τὴν α' Ὀλυμπιάδα υλς', ὁμοῦ ,βπμγ'.¹ If one takes the 1st Olympiad as the only fixed date, working from this Dicaearchus must have put the fall of Troy in the year 1222/1 B.C., and the reign of Nileus in the year 1229/8 B.C.—that is, within the conjectural dates for the reign of Ramesses II (1290-1224 B.C.). While this is not entirely impossible, since the association or identification of the king with the Nile seems to have been a fairly common concept in Egypt,² it does seem improbable that a king as famous as Ramesses II should be commemorated in legends under a totally separate name.³

However, Diodorus says that Nileus was one of the seven successors of Remphis; which one he does not say. But if one takes the traditional date for the fall of Troy as 1183 B.C., and still accepts the statement that Nileus lived seven years before this, the reign of Nileus can be dated to c. 1190. In fact this falls within the brief kingless period (? 1194-1184 B.C.) between the XIXth and XXth Dyns., a more satisfactory chronological position for what seems in fact to be no more than a hypothetical king. It would also, incidentally, make Nileus the seventh, albeit imaginary, successor of Ramesses II.

¹ Cf. Pseudo-Manetho frg. 40 ap. Syncellus, p. 278: Θηβαίων λζ' ἐβασιλεύσε Φρουορῶ ἦτοι Νεῖλος ἔτη ε'.

² Inscriptions have been found comparing both Osiris and Amenemhet III with the Nile: Grapow, *Die Bildlichen Ausdrücke des Ägyptischen*, p. 62.

³ Although he occurs elsewhere as Osymandyas, this can be explained by his prenomen Usima'rē'. While his identification with the Nile (though unattested) *could* have given rise to a separate tradition, one would expect the name Nileus to be associated rather with, e.g. Amenemhet III, who was traditionally far more closely connected with the Nile and irrigation than was Ramesses II.

For the possible origin of the name of the river, see above ch. 19.4.

63.2 Diodorus makes the same mistake as Herodotus in placing the pyramid-builders of the IVth Dyn. after Ramesses II of the XIXth Dyn. Chemmis is the Cheops of Herodotus, II, 124, the Khufu of the monuments. The name Chemmis must be derived by metathesis from *Hnmw-(Hwfw)*; but the king-lists give only the shortened form *Hwfw*. The full form, however, is occasionally found in the cartouches, suggesting that Diodorus' source had his information direct from the Egyptians.

This king was the builder of the Great Pyramid, the largest of the three which make up the group at Giza. The dimensions which Diodorus gives for it are reasonably accurate, although his estimate of its height is exaggerated. The length of each side is between 755 and 756 feet, and the height when complete is reckoned to have been $481\frac{2}{5}$ feet.¹ About a dozen courses and the capstone, possibly of granite, have been removed, while the entire outer facing of Tura limestone has disappeared except for a few blocks at the base.

63.5 The stone used for the greater part of the Giza pyramids is the local nummulitic limestone, and the quarries from which it was obtained have been discovered in the vicinity. It is, however, understandable that Diodorus should have believed that the stone was brought from a distance, as even Petrie was unaware of the existence of the quarries. The facing is of a much finer grained limestone free from fossils, and must come from the famous quarries at Tura.²

The probable method of construction used in building the pyramids can be found in Clarke and Engelbach, *Ancient Egyptian Masonry*, ch. X, and in Lauer, *Problème des pyramides*, p. 161-185. It appears that embankments, or ramps in front of the course were necessary in building involving blocks of any size, and that no tackle other than sleds and levers were used for moving stones.

The meaning of στερεοῦ λίθου must be "hard stone" or "solid stone." It cannot be a translation of the Egyptian (as λίθος σκληρός

¹ Edwards, *The Pyramids of Egypt*, p. 87.

² See above ch. 56.4.

may be, above ch. 57.5), since *mꜣt rwdt* refers to granite, and *inr n rwdt* usually refers to sandstone.¹

CHAPTER 64

64.1 The king Khafrē',² probably a son of Khufu, did not succeed his father immediately. They are separated by Ra'djedef, the brother of Khafrē'. Thus Chabryes should be Ra'djedef, but it appears to be a separate attempt to transcribe Khafrē'. There is a remote possibility that Chabryes represents Kheper, the Horus-name of Ra'djedef: so in the XVIIIth Dyn. list Manetho transcribes (A)kheperen(rē') as Chebron. But the Horus-name was not the name by which the kings were generally known.³ In all Classical sources the kings of the IVth Dyn. are known by their nomen, the kings of the later dynasties by their prenomen or nomen. However, it is clear that Diodorus is recording a variant tradition, and it is possible that his source for this tradition was, directly or indirectly, the Egyptian priests, who may well have retained some record of the Horus-name of Ra'djedef.

The length of Khafrē's reign is uncertain, the total number of years being lost from the Turin Canon, but it can fairly be assumed that Diodorus' estimate of 56 years (like the 66 years which Manetho allows to him) is an exaggeration. Ra'djedef reigned for only eight years.

64.2 The dimensions of the pyramid of Khafrē' are not much smaller than those of the Great Pyramid. Its original height was 471 feet, only 10 feet less than the Great Pyramid, and each side formerly measured $707\frac{3}{4}$ feet.

It is difficult to know exactly what Diodorus meant by the ἀνάβασις in one side: possibly it is a misunderstanding of Herodotus, II, 125, where he says that the pyramid of Cheops was constructed initially like ἀναβαθμοί, that is in a series of steps, the angles of which were subsequently filled in. Alternatively Diodorus may be

¹ Harris, *Lexicographical Studies*, p. 71-74.

² For the possible reading Ra'kha'ef see Gardiner, *Egypt of the Pharaohs*, p. 8of.

³ Emery, *Archaic Egypt*, p. 106f.

referring to the two entrances, one in the north face itself, the other immediately below in the rock foundation of the surrounding pavement.

64.3 The inscription on the Great Pyramid recorded by Diodorus is very similar to that given by Herodotus, II, 125. Since the price named is the same, it seems likely that Diodorus' ultimate source is Herodotus. The exact location of the inscription must remain uncertain: Herodotus' ἐν τῇ πυραμίδι could be translated "in", whereas Diodorus specifically says ἐπὶ τῆς μελίζονος, which can only be "on." The writing referred to might be graffiti, but is more likely to be a food list for the dead king, such as occurs in the pyramids of the VIth Dyn. Spiegelberg, *The Credibility of Herodotus' Account of Egypt*, p. 16n, supposes it to be an external religious text including an offering list, translated by an uneducated dragoman as food assigned to the workmen. Borchardt, *Grabdenkmal des Königs Ne-user-rē*, p. 81 suggests that it may have been an offering-list in the pyramid-temple. The evidence of antiquity perhaps suggests the existence of inscriptions on the now vanished Tura limestone casing of the Great Pyramid.

64.5 Posener, *Littérature et politique dans l'Égypte de la XIIe Dynastie*, p. 10-13, 29-36, shows that in P. Westcar the mild character of Snofru, first king of the IVth Dyn., is contrasted with the autocratic nature of Khufu. This is certainly the tradition recorded by Herodotus, II, 128, who says that both Cheops and Chephren were hated by the Egyptian people. This may or may not have been true in the IVth Dyn. itself. But the contemporaries of Herodotus were probably influenced in their assessment of popular feeling against these two kings by their own preconceived ideas of the amount of forced labour involved in building the pyramids.

64.6 Although no trace of the bodies of either Khufu or Khafrē' remains in the two pyramids, they must originally have been buried there, until their tombs were plundered by robbers.¹

64.6 There is some doubt as to whether or not Menkaurē' succeeded Khafrē' immediately, and there may perhaps have been an

¹ Edwards, *The Pyramids of Egypt*, p. 94.

intervening king represented by Manetho's Bicheris, whose reign may not have lasted more than a few months.¹

Menkaurē' is credited with a possible reign of twenty-eight years in the Turin Canon. His death must have been unexpected, judging from the unfinished buildings of his pyramid complex.

64.7 The pyramid of Menkaurē' is rather smaller than the other two. The base length of each side was 365 ½ feet, i.e. just over three plethra, and the height when complete was 218 feet. The upper part of the pyramid is cased in white limestone, but the lower sixteen (not fifteen) courses have a facing of red granite, some of which remains undressed. It is uncertain whether Menkaurē' intended to dress the entire pyramid with granite: if he did, then the limestone facing must have been added after his death to the unfinished pyramid. If he intended the two-fold facing, then probably only the undressed granite at the base is evidence of his untimely death.

64.7 The μέλας λίθος refers to the red granite facing. Since μέλας means "dark" more often than "black", it is unlikely that Diodorus (and Strabo, XVII, 1.33) mistook red granite for black. The red granite facing must simply have appeared dark in contrast with the white limestone facing (the λίθων ὁμοίων ταῖς ἄλλαις πυραμῖσιν) of the upper courses of the pyramid. There are, however, a few blocks of dark grey granite among the red, both outside and inside the pyramid.²

64.9 As with the case of the hatred felt for Khufu and Khafre', there is similarly little evidence of the goodwill felt for Menkaurē'. The evidence, slight as it is, is to be found in the names of the gangs and boatcrews, listed by Reisner, *Mycerinus*, p. 275. Thus the name of a gang "X (the king)-excites-love", a respectful name, occurs under most of the kings, and therefore probably had little significance. The somewhat disrespectful name "X-is-drunk" occurs only under Menkaurē' and Sahure', and may perhaps indicate that a certain amount of affection was felt for these kings.

¹ For a summary of the evidence of the king-lists see Stevenson Smith, "The Old Kingdom in Egypt", *CAH*², I ch. XIV, p. 31.

² Lucas, *Ancient Egyptian Materials and Industries*, p. 57f.

64.10 Although there is a row of three pyramids beside both the Great Pyramid and that of Menkaurē^c, it is probably the ones by the former that are in question, since it is to these that Herodotus, II, 126, refers.

64.13 In the excerpts from Manetho,¹ Armaeus or Harmais is apparently identified with Danaus, and is ascribed to the XVIIIth Dyn. He is probably to be identified with Haremhab whom Gardiner, *Egypt of the Pharaohs*, p. 242ff., regards as occupying an isolated position between the XVIIIth and XIXth Dyns., since there is no evidence that he was of royal blood, or that he bore any relation to his successors. He served in a military and administrative capacity under Tutankhamūn and Ay, but was later regarded as having re-established the *status quo*, and (mistakenly) as a champion of the worship of Amūn.

Alternatively it has been suggested² that Harmais was a form of Harmachis, the sun-god with whom the Sphinx (which represented Khafre^c in the guise of the sun-god) was identified after its restoration in the XVIIIth Dyn. Pietschmann³ points out that Amasis of the XXVIth Dyn. has also been confused with the Sphinx as a result of the reading Amasis for Harmais in Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, XXXVI, 77.

64.13 Inaros, the son of Psammetichus, obtained Athenian support in his struggle against Persian domination in Egypt.⁴

64.14 Rhodopis was the famous courtesan of Naucratis, with whom Sappho's brother Charaxus was involved. Herodotus, II, 134 discredits the theory prevalent among some Greeks, that she was the builder of the third pyramid, but it is not difficult to see how this misconception might have arisen: Manetho attributes this pyramid to the VIth Dyn. queen, Nitocris, and describes her as ξανθή τὴν χροῖαν (*flava rubris genis*). Possibly she was described by the Greeks as ῥοδῶπις and was later confused with the courtesan

¹ Josephus, *Con. Ap.*, I, 14; Sothis book, p. 293, n. 46; Africanus dyn., XVIII, n. 14.

² Eichholz, comm. on Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, XXXVI, 17, 77 (Loeb ed.).

³ *RE*, I, 1747.

⁴ Thucydides, I, 104, 109f.; Diodorus, XI, 71, 74, 77.

who was also universally described as such, although her real name was apparently Doricha.¹

Manetho's error was first explained by Petrie, *History of Egypt*, I, p. 195, as arising from the confusion between the builder of the third pyramid Menkaurē', and Menkarē', who appears in the Abydos list as the successor of Netjerkarē'. Newberry, "Queen Nitocris of the Sixth Dynasty", *JEA*, XXIX, 1943, 51-54, suggests that Menkarē' may well have been the premen of Nitocris.

The theory proposed by Hall, in *JHS*, XXIV, 1904, 208-213, is that the Sphinx, whose cheeks were tinted red, was called by the Greeks *ῥοδῶπις* and was later taken to be a portrait of the courtesan. The Sphinx, built by Khafrē' in the IVth Dyn., had to be restored by Thutmose IV of the XVIIIth Dyn. Subsequently it was largely buried by drifting sands, and was not wholly uncovered until the Ptolemaic period or later. Before this, what little of the Sphinx was visible must have been unimpressive, and this accounts for the silence of Greek historians on the subject.

CHAPTER 65

Diodorus clearly had little conception of the chronology of Egyptian history, and having dealt earlier with the XIIth and XIXth Dyns., he now leaps from the IVth to the XXIVth Dyn. In the intervening periods Egypt had naturally undergone a vast amount of change, little of which Diodorus mentions.²

At the end of the New Kingdom, under Ramesses IX, the priests of Amūn established at Thebes a theocratic dictatorship. As a result Thebes became virtually a sovereign state ruled by a succession of priest-kings. At the same time, when the Ramessid dynasty was coming to an end c. 1087 B.C., Smendes of Tanis founded the XXIst Dyn. in the Delta. Egypt was now ruled from two capitals, Tanis in the north and Thebes in the south, and relations between the two halves of the country appear to have been amicable.

Around 945 B.C. rule in the north passed into the hands of a

¹ Strabo, XVII, 1.33.

² See Drioton and Vandier, *Les peuples de l'orient méditerranéen*⁴, Vol. II, *L'Égypte*.

family of foreign origin. They appear to have been of stock closely akin to the Libyans, but were by no means new invaders, being probably the descendants of settlers or prisoners. The kings of the XXIIInd Dyn. maintained their centres of rule at Tanis and Bubastis in the Delta, while Thebes continued as a separate state. But relations between the two halves of the country now vacillated between friendship and hostility as Thebes tended to fade into obscurity while the Delta became the centre of action.

The exact chronological relationship between the XXIIInd and XXIIIrd Dyns. is still difficult to establish. There are strong reasons for believing that they were contemporaneous, and there are also references to kings, presumably of this period, who cannot be placed. Such evidence would indicate that the land, at least in the north, was becoming increasingly divided into petty kingdoms, a process which was far advanced during the next phase of Egyptian history.

The XXIVth and XXVth Dyns. were certainly contemporaneous. According to Manetho, the XXIVth Dyn. consisted solely of Bocchoris of Sais, the XXVth of Ethiopian kings. Many centuries before, an Egyptian colony had sprung up at Gebel Barkal. Its capital of Napata had survived without arousing Egyptian attention or interference, while maintaining its Egyptian culture and a devotion to Amon-rē¹ of Thebes. From here the prince Piankhi set out to protect Upper Egypt against Tefnakhte of Sais. It is clear from the stele of Piankhi¹ that by this time the entire Delta and much of Middle Egypt had split into separate principalities, and Tefnakhte of Sais, probably the most powerful of the princes, was now attempting to extend his authority to Middle and Upper Egypt. Piankhi succeeded in capturing Memphis and securing the submission of Tefnakhte, but it was left to his successor Shabaka to overcome the threat of Tefnakhte's son Bocchoris, and establish himself as king of the whole of Egypt.

Unfortunately this apparent reunification of Egypt did not survive the reign of Shabaka and his successor, and it was not long before Lower Egypt and part of Middle Egypt had again dissolved into a number of princedoms. At the same time the threat from Assyria, which had been hanging over Egypt for many years, be-

¹ Breasted, *AR*, IV, 796ff.

came a reality, and the Delta princes were destined to play their part in the struggle between the Ethiopian and the Assyrian kings. Apparently wishing only to retain their independence, they supported now the Assyrian, now the Ethiopian king; but they proved powerless against both, and were finally overcome by Psammetichus, originally one of themselves, but raised by Assyrian support to the position of king of Egypt. Under this king Egypt was finally reunited.

65.1 Bocchoris was the Egyptian king Bakenrenef of the XXIVth Dyn. (? 720-715 B.C.).¹ He was the son of Tefnakhte, prince of Sais, the most powerful of the four Lower Egyptian princes who wielded royal power, while the Lower Egyptian king Osorkon IV, the last of the legitimate line, was kept virtually a prisoner.

Very little is known of Bocchoris apart from the evidence of the Classical authors.²

65.2 Shabaka was the third king of the XXVth Dyn. who ruled perhaps 716-695 B.C. Already king of Upper Egypt, he became king of Lower Egypt after he succeeded in dislodging Bocchoris from Memphis. He thus became the first of his dynasty to rule all Egypt, at least nominally: in practice conditions in the Delta seemed to have approached anarchy.³

Nevertheless, although few details are known of Shabaka's internal policy, he seems to have attempted to repair the worst abuses of administration.⁴ By this time agriculture was suffering a setback, river banks were breached, canals silted up, large tracts of land were lying fallow, and bands of robbers roamed the Delta. Shabaka could not counteract all these, but he appears at least to have made a start.

Shabaka disappears from history after a battle fought outside the limits of Egypt, against the Assyrians. The Assyrians had for some time been threatening Egypt, but Shabaka's efforts served to check their advance, at least temporarily.

¹ Breasted, *AR*, IV, 447, n. c, sees the origin of the name Bocchoris in Bakenrenef's first name, Wahkarê'.

² See Moret, *De Bocchori Rege*; Elgood, *The Later Dynasties of Egypt*, p. 62f.

³ Gyles, *Pharaonic Policies and Administration*, p. 14f.

⁴ Elgood, *op. cit.*, p. 64.

65.5f. There is no evidence that Shabaka had a dream of this nature. It is, however, reminiscent of the theory that protection from harm can be obtained by passing between the two halves of a sacrificial animal.¹ Herodotus, VII, 39 relates that the Persian army on its way to conquer Greece marched between the two halves of the body of the son of Pythius; but this was a punishment for Pythius, not the means of obtaining protection or certain victory for the Persian army.

Although no evidence of any such dream is found for Shabaka, an inscription known as the Dream Stele² provides evidence of a similar type of dream experienced by Tanwetamani, the last king of the XXVth Dyn. According to this, the king dreamed in the first year of his reign that he saw two snakes, one on each hand. This was interpreted as meaning that he already held Upper Egypt, and Lower Egypt was his for the taking. Diodorus' account may be a garbled version of this. It closely resembles the account given by Herodotus, II, 139.

CHAPTER 66

66.1 In the view of Drioton and Vandier, *Les Peuples de l'Orient Méditerranéen*⁴, II, *L'Égypte*, p. 522f. the rule of the twelve, or the Dodecarchy, is a reference to the feudal system established under Assyrian domination when Egypt was invaded by the Assyrian king Esarhaddon in 671 B.C. Few Assyrian troops could be spared to remain in the Delta, and the king was forced to rely upon the princes of the region for maintaining his hold there. Those whose loyalty he doubted he replaced with his own nominees.

These princedoms were already established before the Assyrian invasion, and presumably the vassal princes are the twelve to whom Herodotus and Diodorus refer. Their rule was unsettled, and a conspiracy was formed among them to throw off Assyrian power. The Assyrians, however, reacted swiftly, and removed the princes to Nineveh. Necho of Sais alone was permitted to return to further the Assyrian king's cause in Egypt, and his son Psammetichus was

¹ Cf. Genesis, XV, 10, 17; Jeremiah, XXXIV, 18f.; Q. Curtius, X, 9, 12.

² Breasted, *AR*, IV, 919ff.

established as prince of Athribis. When Psammetichus rose to power, he was forced to subdue the princes, who rose against him, presumably in envy or distrust.¹

66.5 The building which Diodorus says the twelve leaders built as their tomb is the Labyrinth, previously mentioned in ch. 61. All that now survives of the Egyptian Labyrinth are a few remains, and the various, sometimes conflicting descriptions contained in the Classical authors. From this evidence it is impossible to make a definitive reconstruction of the building, which was in fact the mortuary temple constructed not by the Dodecarchy, but by Amenemhet III of the XIIth Dyn.²

As far as the builders of this temple are concerned, Herodotus attributes it to the Dodecarchy, whom he believed to have built it as a memorial to themselves; and this is the tradition followed here by Diodorus. But Diodorus was also aware of an alternative tradition, since in ch. 61 he says that the Labyrinth was built by Mendes or Marrus as his tomb. These names come from one of the names of Amenemhet III,³ and Diodorus is therefore thus far correct. The building, however, was his mortuary temple, not his tomb, and he was buried in the pyramid to the north of the temple.⁴

As has been said, the archaeological remains of the Labyrinth are few. Petrie discovered an immense bed of white limestone chips,

¹ Zeissl, *Äthiopien und Assyrien in Ägypten*, p. 44f.

² For the Classical descriptions of the building, see Herodotus, II, 148; Strabo, XVII, 1.3; XVII, 1.37; Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, XXXVI, 84ff.; Pomponius Mela, I, 56. The most recent, and indeed most plausible, reconstruction is that of Lloyd, "The Egyptian Labyrinth", *JEA*, LVI, 1970, 81-100. Michalowski, "The Labyrinth Enigma: Archaeological Suggestions", *JEA*, LIV, 1968, 219-222, rejects the identification of the Labyrinth with Amenemhet's mortuary temple: he sees it rather as an administrative complex of the Saite period, intended to symbolize the unity of the country, and built so close to the XIIth Dyn. mortuary temple that the two became confused. However, there is nothing in the archaeological remains to suggest the coexistence of two entirely separate buildings; nor have the remains been found of any kings from the period between Amenemhet III and the Ptolemies.

³ Vergote, "Le roi Moeris-Mares", *ZAS*, LXXXVII, 1962, 66-76. Diodorus' failure to connect Mendes/Marrus with the Moeris of ch. 51.5 may stem from the fact either that he was misled by Herodotus' separation of the builder of the lake from the builder of the Labyrinth, or that he was using different sources.

⁴ Strabo seems in fact to have been aware of this.

covering an area approximately 1,000 × 800 feet.¹ From an examination of the levels of the bed, Petrie concluded that the building was rectangular, with additional structures on the east; that it had a great front wall and a cross-wall along the middle; that red granite columns were used in the northern part of the site, and built pillars rather than monolithic columns in the part south of the cross-wall.

Petrie's reconstruction of the site owes much to the accounts of the Classical authors, and has been modified only slightly by himself in the light of further discoveries. He included the forty pillars on each side which Diodorus mentions, and placed the twelve courts of Herodotus, six facing south, six north, south of the middle wall. He was then led astray by a mistranslation of Strabo, as a result of which he believed Strabo to have described a row of peristyle courts backing against one wall, intricate passages before their entrances, and "a hall of twenty-seven columns, which was a striking part of the building, and apparently was connected with the halls." He went further to suggest that the only possible arrangement of the twenty-seven columns would be in a single line along the middle of the hall. He also concluded that six was the most likely number for courts of any size along the back wall.

This reconstruction was later modified after the discovery of two shrines.² By estimating the most likely position of these, Petrie decided that the number of courts along the back wall should be amended to nine. These, with the other courts, would give a total of twenty-one. Strabo maintains, in XVII, 1.37, that the Labyrinth contained a number of courts corresponding with the number of nomes in earlier times, and while the total number of nomes seems never to have been as low as this, in the XIIth Dyn. there were apparently 22 nomes in Upper and 18 in Lower Egypt, while in the Graeco-Roman period there were 22 nomes in Upper and 20 in Lower Egypt.

Strabo's account of the Labyrinth is probably the most reliable, and any attempt to reconstruct the building must consider it carefully. It is, however, clear that Strabo saw a different part of the building from Herodotus: the forecourt with the twelve courts of

¹ Petrie, *Hawara, Biahmu and Arsinoë*, p. 4ff.

² Petrie, *The Labyrinth, Gerzeh and Mazguneh*, p. 28f.

Herodotus may well have been destroyed by the time of Strabo. That the Labyrinth had not survived in its entirety appears to be confirmed by the testimony of Diodorus, who believed it to have remained unfinished. But Petrie's discovery of a dedication by a Ptolemy and Cleopatra indicates that the Labyrinth was still in royal care and possibly being restored at least as late as Cleopatra I (193 B.C.); but it must soon after have fallen into ruins.

The most serious mistake in Petrie's reconstruction is the mis-translation of Strabo, already mentioned. Admittedly the sentence ἐντεῦθεν δὲ πάλιν εἰς τὰς αὐλάς ἐκπίπτοντα ἐξῆς ὁρᾶν κειμένας ὑπὸ μονολίθων κιόνων ὑπηρεισμένας ἑπτὰ καὶ ἑικοσι is ambiguous, in that the twenty-seven could refer to the number of courts as well as to the number of columns; but what it cannot refer to is a hall such as Petrie envisaged. Moreover, Strabo clearly says, earlier in the chapter . . . χωρίον, ἔχον κώμην τε καὶ βασιλείον μέγα ἐκ πολλῶν βασιλείων, ὅσοι πρότερον ἦσαν νόμοι· τοσαῦται γὰρ εἰσιν αὐλαὶ περιστυλου, συνεχεῖς ἀλλήλαις, ἐφ' ἓνα στίχον πᾶσαι καὶ ἐφ' ἑνὸς τοίχου, ὥς ἂν τείχους μακροῦ προκειμένας ἔχοντος τὰς αὐλάς. This implies that the 21 or 22 courts, if this is indeed the correct number, were placed in a single line. Since the breadth of the site is 800 feet, this would give a width of something under 40 feet for each court—a perfectly possible size, though Petrie would condemn it as too small. And indeed it must be admitted that it would be difficult to fit 27 columns into a peristyle court of this size. But the 27 may also be interpreted as the number of the courts. Possible confirmation of this may be found in Strabo, XVII, 1.3, where after talking about the original division of the country into 36 nomes, he goes on ὥς δέ τινες τοσοῦτοι ἦσαν οἱ σύμπαντες νομοὶ ὅσαι αἱ ἐν τῷ λαβυρίνθῳ αὐλαί· αὗται δ' ἐλάττους τῶν τριάκοντα.¹ If a number is "less than 30", it is more likely to be 27 than 22. If this is the case, each of the 27 courts

¹ It is perhaps worth noting that Strabo appears in this chapter to reject the tradition recorded by τινές that the number of courts was the same as the number of nomes. Indeed, the discrepancies between the various numbers involved in the accounts of the different authors are so great that it is difficult to believe that the number of courts bore any specific relation to the number of nomes. Far more likely is it that this was an erroneous assumption made by a visiting Greek. That is not to say, however, that the building could not have been used at some point for administrative purposes.

would measure 28 or so feet across. Although Strabo describes them as peristyle courts, there is no necessity now for them to contain 27 pillars, and the number might be reduced to as few as 6 or 8.

Although any archaeological reconstruction of the building must remain almost totally conjectural for lack of evidence, this is not necessarily true of its function. As Gardiner¹ pointed out, the size of the area and its shape made it unlikely that this mortuary temple can have been one of the ordinary type. And in fact the temple seems to have served more than one function: that it was built primarily as a mortuary temple is clear enough, but in addition it seems to have embodied several divine temples. The archaeological remains suggest this; and in fact Petrie specifically says, "the scanty remains all point to a mass of local worships concentrated in the Labyrinth."² On this point, then, the Classical authors are probably substantially correct.

66.3 The tradition that the Labyrinth was built by the Dodecarchy stems from Herodotus, as does the suggestion that there were twelve vassal princes in the Delta. Mallet, *Les premiers établissements des Grecs en Égypte*, p. 37, n. 2, suggests that the number twelve played an important part in Hellenic mythology;³ but while this might possibly help to explain Herodotus' belief that there were twelve rulers, it can scarcely account for his attributing to them the building of the Labyrinth.

Maspero, "La XIIe dynastie de Manéthon", *Rec. Trav.*, XXVIII, 1906, 8-15, believes that Herodotus was misled by a dragoman, because some incident caused the local inhabitants to place the foundation of the building at this period.⁴ Griffith, in a communication in *ZAS*, XLVII, 1910, 162, suggests that there was some confusion between the XIIth Dyn. and the twelve kings. It has been widely accepted that Manetho was the first to divide Egyptian history into dynasties, which would invalidate such a theory as far as Herodotus is concerned. But Griffith urges that it cannot be assumed that Manetho was in fact the originator of the dynastic

¹ *Egypt of the Pharaohs*, p. 140.

² *The Labyrinth, Gerzeh and Mazguneh*, p. 32. See also Lloyd, *loc. cit.*

³ Cf. e.g. the Labours of Hercules.

⁴ See Michalowski, *op. cit.*

system: it is more probable that he reflected the thought of earlier writers and historians. It has also been suggested that Herodotus drew his ideas of the Dodecarchy from the twelve courts which he saw in the Labyrinth.

66.8 Psammetichus I was the true founder of the XXVIth Dyn. He was the son of Necho of Sais, who appears to have been killed while fighting against the Ethiopian king Tanwetamani on behalf of the Assyrian king.¹ Psammetichus is presumed to have escaped his father's fate by fleeing to Asia, only to return to Egypt in the train of the Assyrian king. Assurbanipal appears to have been impressed with him and to have offered him the governorship of Egypt. It is difficult to analyse the various stages of Psammetichus' rise to power, but this must have been resented by his fellow princes, who prepared to resist. Psammetichus, however, was provided with Greek mercenaries from Ionia, with the aid of whom he made his stand against the princes.²

It may well have been because of this inter-dynastic rivalry in the Delta that the Assyrians decided to attack Thebes and put an end once and for all to the Ethiopian opposition, while at the same time crushing the opposition to Psammetichus among the Delta princes. Certainly Psammetichus appears to have been in full control of the administration of Lower and Middle Egypt as vassal king before the Assyrians left after the sack of Thebes. The agreement between him and Mentuemhet of Thebes indicates that the former was arguing from a position of power;³ he must have had both authority from Assyria, and control of Middle and Lower Egypt. Assyria may well have been forced to accede to this state of affairs through her inability to leave a force of occupation capable of holding the Thebaid as well as the Delta.

Subsequent relations between Assyria and Egypt are confused.⁴ Apparently taking advantage of the rebellions in other parts of the Assyrian Empire, Psammetichus obtained mercenaries from Gyges

¹ Zeissl, *Äthiopien und Assyrier in Ägypten*, p. 46; Gyles, *Pharaonic Policies and Administration*, p. 16.

² Gyles, *op. cit.*, p. 17f.

³ Breasted, *AR*, IV, 935-958; Gyles, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

⁴ Gyles, *op. cit.*, p. 20ff.

of Lydia, and, declaring his independence, made use of them to expel the Assyrian garrison from Egypt in c. 654 B.C. Assyria did not retaliate, and in fact Psammetichus appears later as an Assyrian ally, suggesting that some sort of peace treaty must have been made between Egypt and Assyria soon after his revolt. Certainly he continued to assist Assyria in her struggles against the rising power of Babylon for the rest of his life.

66.10 The story of Psammetichus' libation is told first by Herodotus, II, 151f. It appears to be a tale invented on the strength of the meaning of the name Psammetichus, *p3-s-n-mḥk*, "the man of the mixing-bowl."¹

66.12 It is impossible to determine the locality of Momemphis. Gauthier, *Dictionnaire Géographique*, III, 34 suggests as the prototype for Momemphis, "*mem(t)*: Localité, consacrée au dieu Sebek dans le IVe nome de Basse-Égypte (Prosopite) dont la métropole

était  aujourd'hui Zaouiet Razin à l'ouest de Menouf."² Kees, in *RE*, XVI, 40f. summarizes the evidence and concludes "Nach alle dem ist für Momemphis eine Lage bei Charbeta wahrscheinlicher als bei Terenuthis (Kôm Abu Billu)." Bonnet, *Reallexikon*, suggests that it may be the modern Kôm el-Hisn, but admits that the identification is far from certain.³

Strabo, XVII, 1.22f. says that for anyone sailing from Schedia to Memphis, Momemphis is next after Gynaecopolis; he continues, (23) 'Υπὲρ δὲ Μωμεμφέως εἰσι δύο νιτρῖαι πλεῖστον νίτρον ἔχουσαι καὶ νόμος Νιτριώτης . . . πλησίον δὲ καὶ ἐνταῦθα πόλις Μενέλαος ἐν ἀριστερᾷ δὲ ἐν τῷ Δέλτα ἐπὶ μὲν τῷ ποταμῷ Νάύκρατις, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ποταμοῦ δίσχοινον διέχουσα ἡ Σαῖς. Unfortunately there is some uncertainty as to both the position of Menelaus, and the identity of the natron beds referred to. The largest natron deposit is the Wadi Natrun, but there

¹ See F. Ll. Griffith, *Catalogue of the Demotic Papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester*, III, 201; cf. Plutarch, *DIO*, 6.

² In fact Champollion originally identified Momemphis with Menûf itself. This was accepted by Wiedemann, *Herodots zweites Buch*, p. 527, and by Daressy, *Rev. arch.*, 3me sér., XXV, 208, but was rejected by Amélineau, *Géogr.*, p. 250ff.

³ Cf. also below ch. 68, Marea.

are more natron beds at Barnugi, thirty miles north of the Wadi Natrun and fourteen miles west of ancient Naucratis. If Strabo refers only to the Wadi, the site of Momemphis might be anywhere within a large area. If, however, by "two" he means both the Wadi and the beds at Barnugi, Momemphis must lie somewhere to the north of the latter.

Momemphis is also mentioned in P. Oxyrrhyncus 1380, 14 as one of the places in which Isis was worshipped, but this sheds very little light on the problem of its location. From its position in the text one can assume that it lay slightly to the north-west of Niciu, but since the site of Niciu itself has not been established, this offers no help whatever.¹

CHAPTER 67

67.1 Camps were established by Psammetichus at Daphnae (Tell Defenneh) midway between the sea and Lake Timsah, and at Marea in the north-west Delta, in both cases for purposes of defence. According to Herodotus, II, 30 there was a further camp at Elephantine. It does appear that the Greek mercenaries were later removed by Amasis to Memphis and Sais, and it is possible that they became an embarrassment in peacetime.²

67.3 Diodorus' reference to "a campaign in Syria" is so vague that it is impossible to be certain to exactly which campaign he is referring. At one time the Sinai defences were threatened by an advance of the Scyths. Psammetichus however crossed Sinai to the borders of Canaan and there made a withdrawal pact with the invading force;³ and it may be this incident which Diodorus had in mind. Alternatively he may be referring to one of the later campaigns in which Psammetichus came to the assistance of Assyria, which was threatened first by the increasing power of Babylon

¹ Grenfell and Hunt, *Ox. Pap.*, Vol. XI, p. 205 suggest that Momemphis was the capital not of a nome, but of a toparchy.

² Gardiner, *Egypt of the Pharaohs*, p. 357; Boardman, *The Greeks Overseas*, p. 131, 133, 151.

³ Herodotus, I, 105; Gardiner, *Egypt of the Pharaohs*, p. 357; Gyles, *Pharaonic Policies and Administration*, p. 21f.

and subsequently by the danger of an alliance between the Medes and Babylonians.

The question of the revolt of the army is a difficult one. In the first place Diodorus differs in his version from that given by Herodotus, II, 30. The latter maintains that the reason for the revolt was the fact that the garrisons were not relieved. Diodorus says that it broke out because the mercenaries were preferred to native Egyptians. De Meulenaere, *Herodotus over de 26ste Dynastie*, p. 151, suggests that the story is based on a definite incident in Egyptian history, but that it has suffered embroidery at the hands of the Greeks. There is in any case no evidence of any such revolt under Psammetichus, but there is Egyptian authority for a similar revolt under Apries¹: an inscription on the statue of Neshor in the Louvre shows that there was a defection of the garrison of Elephantine, who fled to Nubia but were pursued and forced to return. It would appear that this is what both Herodotus and Diodorus have in mind, especially as the latter mentions Ethiopia as the destination of the rebels.

What is significant, as Gyles points out,² is that one can assume from the story that Psammetichus could afford to neglect his southern frontier, presumably because he had no fear of the Ethiopians, and that the Ethiopians made no attempt to take advantage of the situation.

67.8f. Nothing is known of any alliance with Athens or with any other Greek state, although at this period Greek traders began to move freely throughout the Delta.³ The skill of the Greeks as mariners was of great use to the king, and he was always willing to receive more skilled soldiers. The Egyptians do not, however, appear to have been at all influenced by Greek thought at this juncture: on the contrary, the Greeks seem always to have been unpopular with the Egyptians, and were tolerated only to the extent that they were of use to the Egyptians. In addition the Saite period saw a deliberate revival of archaism in art and architecture, whole-

¹ Breasted, *AR*, IV, 989-995.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 24f.

³ According to Herodotus, II, 154 and 164, Psammetichus formed a class of official interpreters to facilitate this.

heartedly supported by Psammetichus in an attempt to strengthen patriotism.

The suggestion that Psammetichus gave his sons a Greek education is presumably based on a misunderstanding of Herodotus, II, 154: καὶ δὴ καὶ παῖδας παρέβαλε αὐτοῖσι Αἰγυπτίους τὴν Ἑλλάδα γλῶσσαν ἐκδιδάσκεισθαι.

67.11 Diodorus' account of the myth of Busiris does not appear as a composite whole, and the king of that name is confused by him with the city.¹ Here he explains the early Egyptian custom of killing strangers and Busiris' impiety as a fictitious tale invented because of the Egyptians' disregard for normal customs. In ch. 88, however, he explains the myth more rationally as a sacrifice at the tomb of Osiris of "red" men, the majority of whom must have been non-Egyptian. Red was the colour of Seth and of evil: Seth was the murderer of Osiris, hence the sacrifice at the latter's tomb of men intended to represent his murderer.²

Evidence for the myth of Busiris is collected by Hopfner, *Fontes Historiae Religionis Aegyptiacae*, and is examined by Griffiths, "Human Sacrifice in Egypt: the Classical Evidence", *ASAE*, XLVIII, 1948, 409-423. The story of Busiris can be found in many authors, but about the time of Ovid a fertility theme was introduced, in that the human sacrifice was now excused as the solution for a nine-year drought.³ Griffiths believes the myth to have its origin in Greek rather than Egyptian folk-lore, and compares it with the Tauric cult; in addition no Egyptian equivalents are given for the Greek names of the characters involved.

At first sight there appears to be a certain amount of evidence

¹ See ch. 88.5 (and 85.5). In fact the mythical king appears to be as it were no more than a personification of the city.

² See Wainwright, *The Sky Religion in Egypt*. For the division of men into Seth types and Horus types, see P. Chester Beatty, III, ed. Gardiner, *Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum*, I, p. 9, which contains a fragmentary description of the followers of Seth, and confirms the accounts of Diodorus and Plutarch as to the dislike of redheads. (However, Griffiths, *JEA*, XXV, 1939, 226, believes that *dšr* in this context may refer only to the redness of the eye). For references to the association of redness with Seth, see Griffiths, *Plutarch*, p. 408. For figures of Seth in red wax, see *Urkunden*, VI, 5B; VI, 37.1ff.

³ Ovid, *Ars Amatoria*, I, 647-652; cf. also above ch. 17.3.

in the Classical authors for human sacrifice in Egypt during the Roman period, and perhaps as late as the VIth century A.D.: thus Procopius, *de Bell. Pers.*, I, 19 (32-7) mentions human sacrifice near Elephantine, and this Junker relates to the reliefs at Philae.¹ But it is doubtful whether one can accept the Classical evidence as proof of the existence of human sacrifice. There is no independent archaeological evidence for it as such, and the scenes such as those cited by Junker, depicting the king spearing a number of bound prisoners before a god, show not a specific scene of human sacrifice, but a magic rite by which the king destroys symbolically the enemies of the god, and in return is given strength by the god against his own earthly enemies.² One has then to accept the possibility that the statements of the Classical authors may have been made on the basis of a misinterpretation of similar reliefs, and do not constitute independent evidence for human sacrifice. This is not to say that the sacrifice of human beings did not take place at certain times, but neither the reliefs nor the statements of the Classical authors can be considered a *prima facie* case for it.

However, Jesi, "Rapport sur les recherches relatives a quelques figurations du sacrifice humain dans l'Égypte pharaonique", *JNES*, XVII, 1958, 194-203, concludes that there is definite evidence of human sacrifice for the first two dynasties, but that it was subsequently replaced by something with a magical function.³ He attributes this to the influence of Lower Egypt, whose dominant characteristic, he says, was sympathetic magic (and he compares the representations of food in tombs). On the other hand Weill, *Recherches sur la Ire Dynastie et les temps prépharaoniques*, II, p. 52ff., shows that while there is evidence of human sacrifice in Nubia and the Sudan under Egyptian domination until Byzantine times, and the servants and household might be buried (occasionally alive) with the dead king or noble, there is no evidence from Egypt proper.

¹ Junker, "Die Schlacht und Brandopfer im Tempelkult der Spätzeit", *ZÄS*, XLVIII, 1910, 69-77, esp. p. 70 (ref. to Berlin Ak. photograph 406).

² There is a close connection between these representations, and rituals involving the destruction of images made of wax or other substances; cf. above ch. 21.5.

³ See also Bonnet, *Reallexikon*, s.v. Menschenopfer for the archaeological evidence.

CHAPTER 68

68.1 Apries is the King Ha'a'ibrē' Wahibrē' of the XXVIth Dyn., the Hophra of the Old Testament.¹ According to a stele in the museum at Leiden, he ruled for nineteen years.²

Although many of the details of the campaigns of Apries are confused, he seems in general to have reversed the defensive policy of his predecessors. He played some part in the conflict between Babylon and Judah, and without committing himself seriously, he forced Nebuchadrezzar to postpone the capture of Jerusalem. The evidence for an attack on Tyre and Sidon is scanty in the extreme.³ Menander, *FHG*, IV, p. 477 says that Tyre sought help from Babylon to resist Apries, but there may well be some confusion here between a possible attack by Apries, and the later siege of Tyre by Nebuchadrezzar which lasted thirteen years.⁴ It is also possible, though there is no evidence, that the Egyptian fleet raided the coastline of Cyprus.

The downfall of Apries is given in greater detail by Herodotus, II, 161ff. The root of the trouble was the Greek colony of Cyrene which became involved in a struggle with the surrounding Lybians. The Libyan chieftain applied to Apries for assistance, and Apries dispatched a native force, presumably being unwilling to allow his Greek mercenaries to fight Greeks. The native force, being inferior in fighting ability to the Greeks, were severely defeated and many were slaughtered. This aroused a wave of hatred in Egypt against both the Greeks and Apries, whom they blamed for the disaster. The Egyptian army was now in revolt, and found a willing leader in Amasis (Ahmose) who was originally sent by Apries to pacify his troops. Apries retained the support only of his Greek mercenaries, and his ultimate defeat was inevitable.

Amasis and Apries appear to have met in battle twice, although both Herodotus and Diodorus speak of a single encounter. Presum-

¹ See Gardiner, *Egypt of the Pharaohs*, p. 36of.; Gyles, *Pharaonic Policies and Administration*, p. 32ff.

² The standard chronology is 588-570 B.C., but for the problems see Gyles, *op. cit.*, App. A.

³ Herodotus, II, 161.

⁴ See Gyles, *op. cit.*, p. 31f.

ably after the battle of Momemphis or Marea, Apries was driven north to take refuge with his supporters in various parts of the Delta, where he prepared a counter-attack. This would probably have taken place in the first year of Amasis' reign. The Elephantine Stele¹ indicates that a second battle then took place, in the course of which Apries was finally killed.² However, Herodotus intimates that Apries was captured during the first battle, and subsequently enjoyed a certain amount of freedom until the Egyptians demanded his death. It may well be that he was captured, but escaped to rally his supporters.³

It is most unlikely that Apries and Amasis were ever associated on the throne. The nineteen years of Apries' reign are normally counted until the first year of Amasis' reign (570-526 B.C.) and it is improbable that the last three years of Apries' reign coincided with the first three of Amasis' as was originally thought. However, it is possible that Apries survived Amasis' accession by three years as a fugitive; in which case the nineteen years of his actual reign together with the three years after his deposition would give a total of twenty-two years, which Diodorus gives as the total length of his reign.

Amasis ruled for forty-four years.⁴ According to tradition he was a popular king and his prudence obviously contrasted well with the rashness of Apries. It is possible that Amasis' restraint of the Greeks in Egypt and his insistence that the Greek traders operate through Naucratis were largely responsible for his popularity among the Egyptians. His chance to seize Cyprus came when Babylon evacuated Syria and Palestine. The date of this conquest is uncertain: *CAH*, III, p. 306 places it tentatively in 560 B.C., but it was probably later than this. Amasis was subsequently forced to abandon Cyprus when the Persians captured Phoenicia. He died only a few months before Cambyses invaded Egypt in 526-5 B.C.

¹ Breasted, *AR*, IV, 996-1007.

² Jelinkova-Reymond, "Quelques recherches sur les reformes d'Amasis", *ASAE*, LIV, 1957, 251-287.

³ See Elgood, *The Later Dynasties of Egypt*, p. 101f.; Gyles, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

⁴ Parker, "The Length of Reign of Amasis, and the Beginning of the XXVIth Dynasty", *MDAIK*, XV, 1957, 208-212.

68.5 The decisive battle between Amasis and Apries was fought, according to Herodotus, II, 169, at Momemphis, hitherto unidentified.¹ Diodorus, however, says that it was fought near Marea, which is usually identified with the ruins on the southern shore of Lake Mareotis, opposite Sidi Kireir.²

According to the stele which records the triumph of Amasis, the battle was fought at ^{mn}⊗ *m'b(t)*.³ Gauthier, *Dictionnaire Géographique*, III, p. 15 suggests that this was the Graeco-Roman Andropolis, the modern Kherbeta.⁴ Gardiner, *Egypt of the Pharaohs*, p. 361, however, identifies it with Sekhetmafka near Terana on the Canopic branch of the Nile.⁵ None of these places are particularly near the site of Marea. However, Ptolemy, *Geography*, IV, 5, records a place called Παλαιμάρεια κώμη⁶ or "Ancient Marea", in the same latitude as Climax and On (Heliopolis), and in the same longitude as Didymae. Thus Palaemarea is to be found north-west of Lake Moeris, and south of Lake Mareotis, considerably nearer to the conjectured site of Momemphis than is the southern shore of Lake Mareotis.

CHAPTER 69

69.4 For Orpheus see ch. 23; for Homer ch. 12; for Pythagoras and Solon ch. 98.

69.7 In spite of Diodorus' claim to the contrary, his chapters on Egyptian history owe much to Herodotus. It is, however, obvious that they are not taken directly from Herodotus, since they contain a certain amount of information which does not occur in the latter's history.⁷ In the Hellenistic period Herodotus became discredited as an historian, and it is clear that Diodorus is following the prevailing opinion.

69.7 While Diodorus may well have spoken to certain Egyptian

¹ See above ch. 66.12.

² Ball, *Egypt in the Classical Geographers*, p. 51.

³ Deressy, "Stele de l'an III d'Amasis", *Rec. Trav.*, XXII, 1900, 2-3.

⁴ With which Kees, in *RE*, XVI, p. 40f. identifies Momemphis.

⁵ Cf. Gardiner, *Ancient Egyptian Onomastica*, II, p. 161*.

⁶ Cf. Athenaeus, I, 33d.

⁷ See above p. 26f.

priests, since Greek would by that time have been spoken fairly widely in Egypt, it is hardly to be imagined that he was able to make use of their written records. There is no evidence that he understood hieroglyphs,¹ still less that he had any knowledge of hieratic or demotic.

CHAPTER 70

70.iff. The picture of the regulation of the king's life given in this chapter, although an idealistic representation,² is Egyptian not Greek in origin, and may go as far back as the late Ramessid era.³ Indeed it may go further back even than this, since from earliest times kingship and religion were inseparable in Egypt: the king, as the only god on earth, was responsible for the well-being both of the rest of the gods and of the people he ruled. He was, in short, the upholder of Ma'at, which is probably best translated as "world order", and, endowed by the gods with all wisdom and virtue, he was bound in return to protect the gods and his people from all hostile or evil forces. As a result the king's life was lived in an almost totally religious context. In origin, at least, his every act must have had religious significance, and as intermediary between the gods and mankind he represented them all in his actions.

Thus, for example, Blackman suggests, with particular reference to the ritual of Amūn,⁴ that the preparation of the dead king's body for burial, the ceremony of the "Opening of the Mouth", and the daily temple liturgy were all based on the ceremonial toilet of the early Heliopolitan kings. This toilet was made daily at dawn in the so-called "House of the Morning" before the king entered the sun-temple at Heliopolis to officiate as high priest. But none of the representations of the rite of the "House of the Morning" now

¹ See above p. 32.

² Gyles, *Pharaonic Policies and Administration*, p. 56f., however, considers it to be an accurate if depressing picture of one of the later Ptolemies who was controlled by, instead of controlling the religious aspects of kingship.

³ Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*, II, 2, p. 42-45. See also his *Gottestaats, Militärherrschaft und Ständewesen in Ägypten*, p. 37ff. (= 529ff.).

⁴ "Sequence of the Episodes in the Egyptian Daily Temple Liturgy", *Journal of the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society*, 1918-1919, p. 27-53. See also his earlier article, "The House of the Morning", *JEA*, V, 1918, 149-165.

preserved are earlier than the XVIIIth Dyn., when the rite was a simple purification undergone by the king before he officiated in any temple: it was no longer the elaborate ceremony of earlier times when it was the King's actual morning toilet as well as an important religious ceremony, when the concepts of god and king were so closely interwoven that what affected one affected the other. The ritual was not in fact confined to Heliopolis, but was reproduced substantially at both Abydos and Karnak.

The daily temple ritual is also described by Fairman with reference to the temple at Edfu.¹ Basically the ritual involved lustration, anointing, robing, and the offering of food to the gods, and on particular festivals, e.g. the New Year Festival, the king himself would participate. Three main services were held during the day, at dawn, midday and evening; but there are also references to the twelve hours of the day and the twelve hours of the night, and it is possible that there were rites celebrated at each hour of the day and night, although nothing is known of them. Fairman also mentions the Sacred Marriage Festival, a festival of some importance in Upper Egypt, when Hathor at Dendera embarked on a river journey to Edfu (stopping at other places on the way) to visit Horus as his bride.² One wonders whether Diodorus has not confused religious ritual, with which the king was once inextricably bound, with the day-to-day life of the king.

It is obvious that in this situation some form of guidance from the priests would have been necessary for the king, but it is difficult to know how far Diodorus is exaggerating the power of the priests. Certainly in the New Kingdom the religious ideal succeeded in completely overshadowing the monarchy, when Thebes rose to power virtually as an autonomous state ruled by the high priests.³ The close connection between king and priesthood persisted until a late date, and even the Ptolemies, who sought acceptance through their avid reverence for Egyptian religion, maintained the fiction—if indeed it was in all cases a fiction.

¹ "Worship and Festivals in an Egyptian Temple", *Bull. of John Rylands Library*, vol. XXXVII, no. 1, Sept., 1954, 165-203.

² See in particular Alliot, *Le culte d'Horus à Edfou au temps des Ptolémées*, II, p. 441-560.

³ See below ch. 73.2f.

70.11 Certain foods were forbidden to the king and to the priests on the grounds of impurity. Thus when the princes of the land came to do homage to Piankhi, only one was admitted to his presence: the rest had eaten fish and were therefore impure.¹

CHAPTER 71

71.1 If we are to believe Plutarch, *Mor.*, 174c, justice in Egypt had to be seen to be done: οἱ Αἰγυπτίων βασιλεῖς κατὰ νόμον ἑαυτῶν τοὺς δικαστὰς ἐξώρκιζον ὅτι κἂν βασιλεὺς τι προστάξῃ κρῖναι τῶν μὴ δικαίων, οὐ κρινοῦσι. It does appear that the king could not in fact punish at will, but was restricted by the legal system: every defendant was entitled to a hearing and could not be condemned out of hand. However, once the courts had found a man guilty, the king was apparently unrestricted in his choice of punishment.²

The picture this chapter presents of the apparently universal respect and goodwill with which the king was regarded by his subjects, is totally idealistic. It also, incidentally, contradicts flatly what Diodorus has already said in ch. 64.5 concerning the hatred in which the pyramid builders were held by the people.

CHAPTER 72

72.2f. For a study of mourning, and in particular of the question of the professional mourner, see Werbrouck, *Les pleureuses dans l'Égypte ancienne*. From the representations it appears that there were two types of mourning: the ritual one which was represented in painting, but not always carried out; and the personal family mourning.³ Women are shown with hair and clothes in disorder,⁴ and mourners generally appear without jewelry or ornament. Although some are shown covering their heads with dust, the oldest sign of grief was the raising of the arms.⁵

¹ Stele of Piankhi, in Breasted, *AR*, IV, 882; cf. Gardiner, *Egypt of the Pharaohs*, p. 339f. (See also above ch. 36.1.)

² See below ch. 75.

³ Werbrouck, *op. cit.*, p. 119f.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 126; figs. 64, 70, 95.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 132.

It may be said that the signs of mourning described by Diodorus were not confined to Egypt, but were to be found among many ancient peoples;¹ they can still be seen today in countries such as India.

72.4f. For funerary practices and the judgement of the dead in general, see below chs. 91 and 92.

72.6 There is no evidence for the denial of burial to kings: however, it was not uncommon for a king to dishonour the memory of his predecessor by obliterating the latter's name on monuments and substituting his own, thereby appropriating them for himself. In addition the royal tombs were systematically ransacked by tomb-robbers in search of the treasures with which the royal (and noble) dead were buried, and in the process countless bodies of kings have vanished without trace. It is also possible that the bodies were destroyed by enemies. Thus Herodotus, III, 16, records that Cambyzes deliberately destroyed the body of Amasis.

CHAPTER 73

73.1 Egypt was divided for administrative purposes into large districts or nomes, each ruled by an official delegate of the central administration, the nomarch. The number of nomes varied: there seem to have been 38 or 39 in the Old Kingdom, 42 by the Late Period. They appear to have been divided on the basis of irrigation and agriculture, since the original title of the nomarch was "he who digs the canals."

73.2-74.7 Préaux, *L'Économie royale des Lagides*, p. 482f., suggests that although the land detached from the royal estates and consecrated to the gods was vast,² there is no need to regard Diodorus' statement as literally true. It may be compared with the political system of Hippodamus in Aristotle, *Pol.*, II, 8 and V, 1.2, and perhaps reflects the theories concerning the ideal distribution of land prevailing in Greece since the Vth century B.C. The system of Hippodamus would divide the land into three parts, sacred, public

¹ Cf. the Biblical sackcloth and ashes.

² Cf. above ch. 46.

and private: the sacred to pay for religious services, the public to support the military class, the private belonging to the husbandmen. But in the Egyptian system, according to Diodorus, the husbandmen had no share: the third part belonged to the crown.¹

There is still room for much research before an accurate assessment of the development and stratification of Egyptian society can be made. There is, however, little evidence that the Egyptian social classes can be as neatly divided one from the other as the Greeks believed. What does seem particularly to have caught the attention of the Greeks was the expectation that professions should be hereditary, resulting in a fairly fixed caste system.² However, the number of castes varied according to the different methods of assessment. Thus Herodotus lists seven,³ Diodorus five.

At the apex of the social structure stood the king. It may be that there was also a "Second after the King", whose task was to "exercise the military, judicial and administrative functions which the Pharaoh alone in theory possessed."⁴ Immediately below him were the heads of administration of the army and priesthood, officials responsible only to the king. They received a substantial remuneration in addition to other rewards, such as royal gifts. Much of the land owned by the king was placed under the control of royal officials or was given in perpetuity to the temples; but it might also be granted to officials, who could manage it and reap the profits during their lifetime. This gave rise to a system of property. The nobles also owned waste-land which they had reclaimed themselves, and much could be bequeathed to their children. Moreover, the king frequently conferred hereditary offices and benefices.

Below the nobles came what may be termed a middle class, although in fact there was no true middle class in Egypt. It consisted of the lower trained officials, the scribes, priests, artists and craftsmen, who were paid in kind with the addition of bounties, and were the retainers of the upper class.

¹ According to Genesis 47.26, the governmental share was $\frac{1}{5}$.

² Herodotus, II, 164.

³ II, 164-168. A census under Thutmose IV listed soldiers, priests, royal serfs and craftsmen (Breasted, *AR*, II, p. 165n).

⁴ Bradford Welles, "Ptolemaic Administration in Egypt", *Journal of Juristic Papyrology*, III, 1949, 21-47.

Finally there came the peasants. Although Diodorus includes farmers and herdsmen with artists among the free citizens, this was often not the case. In the Old Kingdom, the peasants consisted of gangs of land-workers, but in the Middle and New Kingdoms they might be free tenants, smallholders, serfs, imported slaves, or prisoners-of-war. In all cases they were liable to service in the *corvée*, and in spite of Diodorus' assertion that they were not "swamped" (*βαπτίζουσι*) with taxation, they were nevertheless subject to taxation of various sorts. But although certain of them were the property of crown or temple, or even of private individuals, and subject to be sold, hired out or bequeathed, their status was not that of slaves in the accepted sense: they retained legal rights which were the same for all subjects. They could also own possessions, have their own servants, marry free women, and inherit land. But there was never a class of peasants consisting of free citizens.

The life of the peasant farmer was probably not totally unpleasant. The frequent exhortations to young men to become scribes rather than farmers suggest that the life of the latter, though painted black, nevertheless had some attraction.¹

73.2f. Egyptian priests were not priests in the modern sense. Far from being the spiritual leaders of the people (who were in any case rarely allowed into the temples), they were basically servants of the gods who were at all times present in the temples; it was their duty to attend to the material needs of these gods. These duties were performed by the priests as delegates of the king. Offices within the priesthood were often hereditary, but might also be bought, or granted as a gift from the king. The term "priest" covers all ranks of the hierarchy from the heads of the temple administration and the "prophets" down to the priests attached to the "House of Life",² who included lector-priests and scribes.³

The power of the priesthood was immense, reaching its peak at the end of the XXth Dyn., when the first prophet of Amon-rē at

¹ P. Anastasi, V, 15.6-17.3; P. Sallier, I, 6.1-6.9; P. Lansing, 5.8-7.6; see Caminos, *Late Egyptian Miscellanies*.

² See above ch. 49.

³ For an analysis of the priestly hierarchy, see Bonnet, *Reallexikon*, s.v. Priester.

Karnak, Hrihor, became a powerful rival of the weak king Rameses XI.¹ The Theban theocracy thus founded by Hrihor continued under his descendants (few of whom, however, actually called themselves king), while a new dynasty, the XXIst, arose simultaneously at Tanis. Egypt was now ruled from two capitals: the main capital was in the north, first at Tanis, later at Bubastis, while at Thebes the high-priests held undisputed religious authority. Relations between the two centres were at first amicable. Presumably the unsettled conditions throughout the country prevented Thebes from interfering with the Tanite kings. But because of their military origins, the priests must have seen the latter as a constant threat, and relations subsequently fluctuated between friendship and enmity. Finally Sheshonq I appointed his son as high-priest of Amon-rē at Karnak, bringing the office under the king's close supervision, and ending the hereditary aspect of the office.²

Although the priesthood was not entirely a hereditary profession, after the New Kingdom priests were usually drawn from priestly families³; and by Ptolemaic times the son followed his father.⁴ At all times the three main requisites for a priest seem to have been that he should come from a priestly family, be able to read hieratic, and have been circumcized.⁵

73.7 Although Egypt was not originally particularly aggressively inclined, even in the Old Kingdom she had her nucleus of regular soldiers. These formed a few permanent bodies normally used for peaceful purposes such as providing the palace-guard, or for public works. In times of emergency the force was augmented by contingents conscripted by the local governors.

It was not until the New Kingdom, and in particular the great campaigns of the XIXth Dyn., that professional soldiers came into their own. At this time the native Egyptian troops were augmented by foreign soldiers, probably either prisoners of war or their children,

¹ Gardiner, *Egypt of the Pharaohs*, p. 305f.

² Gardiner, *op. cit.*, p. 328.

³ Kees, *Das Priestertum im ägyptischen Staat*, p. 2ff.

⁴ Otto, *Priester und Tempel*, I, p. 217.

⁵ Sauneron, "Les conditions d'accès à la fonction sacerdotale à l'époque Gréco-Romaine", *BIFAO*, LXI, 1962, 55-57.

since there is no evidence that mercenaries were employed at that time.¹ However, the political power of the army, which had been responsible for establishing on the throne Haremhab between the XVIIIth and XIXth Dyns., became suspect to later kings, who preferred to rely upon foreign troops. After the XXVIth Dyn. hoplites from Greece and Caria formed an important part of the Egyptian army.

The XXIst and subsequent dynasties saw the establishment of a native military caste, called by the Greeks μάχιμοι. As with the priesthood, the profession became more or less hereditary.² The soldier, both native and foreign, could amass great wealth: in addition to being given a share in booty, he was exempt from all taxes, and did indeed enjoy an income from the land. Thus the Sherden, who first appear in Egyptian sources during the reign of Ramesses II and were apparently captured during a sea-battle, appear almost at once in the king's body-guard. And a century later they are recorded as tending their own plots, which were presumably given to them as a reward for their military services.³

The part played by the μάχιμοι under the Ptolemies is doubtful. They were certainly still in existence, and were probably employed in a minor military capacity as policemen etc. from the beginning of the dynasty. But Ptolemy's army seems to have consisted mainly of Macedonian troops, though he may have supplemented these with Egyptians on occasion. Nevertheless, when at the end of the IIIrd century B.C. Philopator put native troops in the field, this was regarded as an innovation.

The Egyptian practice of allocating plots of land to each soldier was continued under the Ptolemies, resulting in the holding of Egyptian land by a fair number of Graeco-Macedonian soldiers. Technically these plots of land were not hereditary, but reverted to the king on the death of the holder. In practice the king would immediately reallocate the land to the son of the deceased man, provided he had one, and provided that the son was able-bodied

¹ Gardiner, *op. cit.*, p. 259.

² See Meyer, *Gottesstaat, Militärherrschaft und Ständewesen in Ägypten*, p. 29-37 (= 521-529).

³ Gardiner, *loc. cit.*

and could serve in turn as a soldier. Eventually however, the plots descended automatically to the surviving son, if any; and by the 1st century B.C. inheritance was extended to next of kin.¹

CHAPTER 74

74.1f. For the class structure, see above ch. 73.

74.4 According to Aristotle, *Hist. Anim.*, VI, 2, eggs were hatched artificially in Egypt by being buried in dung. Wilkinson, *Manners and Customs of the Egyptians*, (1878), II, p. 449f. maintains that the artificial incubation of eggs was continued even in his own time. The eggs were collected from the peasants by the proprietors of the ovens, and were placed on mats strewn with bran in the upper storey of the two-tiered oven buildings. The ovens themselves were in the lower storey, and the temperature of the building was carefully regulated. Once the eggs were hatched, half the chicks were returned to the peasants; the rest were kept by the proprietors in payment.²

74.6 There does seem to have been a general system in Egypt of apprentice and master. It would be natural for a son to follow in his father's footsteps rather than enter a new walk of life, but it is unlikely that this was at any time stipulated by law. Such schools as there were, were only elementary, and further learning had to be gained by apprenticeship.³ Although Diodorus emphasizes that the artisan's profession was compulsorily hereditary, he also says that various other professions were hereditary, though perhaps with less compulsion. In general this is confirmed by the monuments. For example, a master builder under Darius I could trace back his ancestry to Imhotep, the master builder of the time of Djoser of the IIIrd Dyn.⁴

Why the artisans alone should come in for such anti-democratic

¹ Bevan, *History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty*, p. 171f.

² See also Bay, "Les fours à poulets en Égypte", *Bulletin de l'Institut Égyptien*, V, 1911, 177-187.

³ Gardiner, "The House of Life", *JEA*, XXXIV, 1938, 157-179.

⁴ Lepsius, *Denkmäler*, III, 275a; see also above ch. 73.

censure, it is difficult to say: one might imagine that all men are subject to political or other distractions. Certainly Diodorus must be criticizing the democracies of Greece, and perhaps of Athens in particular, where the artisans, living for the most part in the town, would be far more liable to be distracted from their work by political meetings than would the farmers, who obviously lived outside the town and out of easy access to such meetings. But theoretically at least there would be nothing to prevent the farmer dabbling in other interests or occupations and thereby suffering exactly the same ill-effects as the artisans would.

CHAPTER 75

75.1 Although Diodorus describes only one court, his words imply that he was aware that more than one court existed. The formation and extent of influence of these courts differed at various stages of Egyptian history, but unfortunately too little is known of the details. In the Old Kingdom, for example, the courts can only be guessed at from judicial titles—King, Vizir, Nomarch—and it would appear that local authorities were employed as judges. As at a later date, the king was the ultimate judge, and it was he who would dictate the more severe punishments.

For the New Kingdom and later there is rather more evidence.¹ The chief justice was still the king, and the infliction of any punishment worse than mutilation was reserved for him. Directly beneath the king was the vizir,² later the leader of the *knbt ʿ3t*, or “Great Kenbet”. In this council there appears to have been no voting, merely consultation with the vizir, who took full responsibility for his decisions. The judicial function of the vizir was probably confined to civil cases, and the occasional outstandingly important criminal case.³ But although he could judge the guilty, he could not impose sentence. Thus in the trial of the tomb robbers⁴ the vizir could

¹ Seidl, *Einführung in die ägyptische Rechtsgeschichte bis zum Ende des neuen Reiches*.

² For a summary of the functions of the vizir see Hayes, in *CAH*², II, ch. 9, section viii.

³ Faulkner, “The Installation of the Vizier”, *JEA*, XLI, 1955, 18-29.

⁴ Peet, *The Great Tomb Robberies of the Twentieth Egyptian Dynasty*.

acquit the innocent and judge the guilty, but the right to pass sentence upon the latter was reserved for the king.

Apart from the Great Kenbet, a special court might be established to try a single particular case: this was true of the judges appointed to try the harem conspirators under Ramesses III.¹ In this instance the court was commissioned by the king and given full discretion as to the verdict together with final power to execute punishment, a right usually reserved for the king himself. Further down the legal hierarchy were the local courts, also called Kenbet. It was probably by these local authorities that criminal cases of murder, assault, robbery etc. were tried. The numbers of judges in both the local and Great Kenbet are uncertain.

The number of vizirs varied at different times: originally there was only one, but in the New Kingdom, and as early as Thutmose III, two vizirs are known, one in charge of the administration of the south, with his centre at Thebes; the other in charge of the north. According to an inscription from the tomb of Rekhmirē, a court was at an early date placed at the disposal of the Theban vizir.² But the absence of references to it in the inscription indicates that when the document was originally composed (at a date before the vizir Rekhmirē), the court either did not exist or was relatively unimportant. Moreover, at the time of the inscription there was only one vizir. However, when a second vizir was appointed for the north, it is probable that a similar court was appointed for his assistance. These courts were the Great Kenbet over which the vizirs presided. The inscription of Mes³ proves the existence of the northern court, but the evidence is too scanty to know whether the two courts co-existed throughout the New Kingdom. There is a further problem in that the inscription of Mes talks of the vizir having authority in Heliopolis, and distinguishes his Great Kenbet from the Kenbet of Memphis. But it is usually assumed that the centre of the northern vizir was Memphis, because he is occasionally called the High Priest of Ptah.

¹ De Buck, "The Judicial Papyrus of Turin", *JEA*, XXIII, 1937, 152-164.

² Davies, *The Tomb of Rekh-mi-Rē at Thebes*, I, p. 80, text of self-appraisal l. 11: "... He gave me a court of justice under my authority, and none of them could overrule me."

³ Gardiner, *The Inscription of Mes, Untersuchungen*, IV, 3, (1905).

From the inscription of Mes, Gardiner concludes that important civil lawsuits, in this case concerning the division of land, were brought directly to the notice of the vizir (at Heliopolis or Thebes), the procedure being as follows: in the first instance a written complaint was laid before the vizir. If the charge was sufficiently important, permission was given to the litigants to appear before the Great Kenbet. Both plaintiff and defendant stated their claims, and the evidence, oral and documentary, was examined. If it was sufficient to admit a conclusion, the vizir gave his verdict. But in cases concerning the partition of lands further local settlement was necessary. The commissioner of the Great Kenbet was sent out to arrange the details with the nearest local court, in this case the Kenbet of Memphis. If local witnesses were to be heard, their evidence would be heard in commission by the representative of the Great Kenbet and by the local court.

This was obviously not the procedure followed in all suits: a petty quarrel over a debt in the reign of Akhenaten could be settled by the local Kenbet. Clearly unimportant disputes were settled by local authorities.¹ At the same time cases concerning the lands leased to temples would be heard by a religious, not a secular court.

The XIXth Dyn. saw a strange legal innovation in the introduction of the practice of seeking a verdict from an oracle.² This practice seems to have developed for some time alongside the traditional forms of litigation and after the New Kingdom there are instances of oracular decisions actually contradicting the evidence of the cadastral register.³ During this period the part played by priests in lawsuits naturally increased in importance.

The Persians appear not to have made any fundamental changes in the Egyptian law. Indeed, according to Diodorus, Darius was a respected law-giver.⁴ The legal system, however, became increasingly complicated under the Ptolemies, since the Greeks in Egypt

¹ Cf. Gardiner, "Four Papyri of the XVIIIth Dyn. from Kahun", *ZAS*, XLIII, 1906, 27-47, where the local magistrates appear to have ratified the earlier transactions over which the dispute had now arisen.

² Seidl, *op. cit.*, p. 38f.

³ Cf. Černý, "Egyptian Oracles", in Parker, *A Saite Oracle Papyrus in the Brooklyn Museum*, p. 35-48.

⁴ See below ch. 95.4.

were governed by Greek law, the Egyptians by Egyptian law.¹ At the same time there existed the "royal law", and the government proclaimed laws binding on both Greeks and Egyptians, especially in such fields as taxation.

It is clear that the position of the judge in the court of law varied: in the Old Kingdom for instance it was less, while that of the witnesses was more important. Thus in P. Berlin 9010² where A. lays a document before the court and B. disputes its authenticity, the court decides that if A. can produce three witnesses to swear that the document is genuine, he will win his case. The fault lies in the fact that the witnesses need not actually have seen the document signed, but need only have faith in A. But by the New Kingdom, the judge was bound by regulations to weigh the evidence carefully and to give judgement where possible according to precedent, thus taking a far more important part in the proceedings.

Finally it should be noted that there was no form of appeal to a higher court in Egyptian law, because the highest court was consulted in the first place. The nearest thing to an appeal was a retrial, which might be obtained. And it is clear from the inscription of Mes that the lands of Neshi had been the subject of no less than five different lawsuits.

75.2 The picture of the Egyptian legal system painted by Diodorus is obviously idealistic, and it is equally obvious that bribery was as rife in the Egyptian lawcourts as anywhere else. The Instruction of Amenemope 21.3 advises, "Receive not the gift of a strong man, nor repress the weak for him."³ And two of the judges trying those involved in the harem conspiracy⁴ allowed themselves to be corrupted, or were at least indiscreet, and subsequently found themselves in the dock. Both were condemned to have their ears and noses cut off, but one of them anticipated his sentence by committing suicide.

75.3 There appears to be definite Egyptian evidence for a Council

¹ Seidl, *Ptolemäische Rechtsgeschichte*.

² Sethe, *ZAS*, LXI, 1926, 67-79.

³ Griffith, *JEA*, XII, 1926, 191-231; cf. P. Bologna, 1094, 2.3f. (= P. Anastasi, II, 6.5ff.).

⁴ See De Buck, *op. cit.*, (above p. 219 n. 1).

of Thirty, although the period at which it flourished is unknown.¹ Gardiner, *Admonitions of an Egyptian Sage*, p. 2f., and 17f., suggests that on philological considerations, the background of events for this papyrus, which mentions the "Houses of the Thirty", should be placed in the VIIth-Xth Dyns. However, Van Seters, "A Date for the 'Admonitions' in the Second Intermediate Period", *JEA*, L, 1964, 13-23, suggests that the most likely date is the late XIIIth Dyn.

Maspero, *Études Égyptiennes*, II, (Paris 1890), p. 197ff. regards the account of Diodorus (or of Hecataeus of Abdera) as virtually worthless. He suggests that Hecataeus was influenced or confused by the tripartite division of Egypt which occurred not earlier than the Ptolemies, and that his theory of the election of ten judges for the Delta, ten for the Heptanomis and ten for the Thebaid is invalid for an earlier date. He does, however, recognize the judicial nature

of the body, but sees the writing of the name  as purely syllabic without any numerical significance.

Gardiner, *Admonitions*, p. 50, on the other hand, believes that a court of thirty probably did exist at some early period of Egyptian history, and that Diodorus' account contains a reminiscence of it, although with some anachronisms. In addition he suggests that the titles "great of the ten of Lower Egypt" and "great of the ten of Upper Egypt" are connected with the Council of Thirty.²

75.5 (and 48.5) Truth and justice were embodied in the Egyptian goddess Ma'at,³ usually shown wearing an ostrich-plume on her head. The importance of the part played by Ma'at in the regulation of justice is clear: at the judgement of the dead, for example, the heart of the deceased was weighed in the balance against Ma'at. And the vizir, head of the supreme court, was known as the "priest of Ma'at."

¹ Brugsch, *Hierogl.-demot. wört.*, p. 1088-9 and Supp., p. 92-99.

² Sethe, "Die Namen von Ober- und Unterägypten", *ZAS*, XLIV, 1907, 1-29. Cf. also Vikentiev, "Les rites de la réinvestiture royale", *Bull. de l'Inst. d'Égypte*, XXXVII (1), 1954-5, 271-316.

³ For a definition of Ma'at, see Bonnet, *Reallexikon*, s.v. Maat; C. J. Bleeker, *Egyptian Festivals, Enactments of Religious Renewal*, p. 6-8.

Small statuettes or amulets in lapis lazuli of the goddess Ma'at have been discovered, often set with an eye through which a chain might be passed,¹ presumably for the purpose of suspending the image round the neck, possibly of judges. This is substantiated by Egyptian evidence in Edfu, I, 580, 3; Piehl, *Rec. Inscr. Hierogl.*, 2e serie, p. 41: "Les prophètes vont à droite et à gauche de tous les côtés de ce dieu. Autour de leurs cous est suspendue la princesse Maat, faite en vrai lapis-lazuli, orné d'or excellent." Whether or not these images played an active part in the dispensation of justice is unknown. Grdseloff, in *ASAE*, XL, 1940, 193 says "Rendre la justice, c'est 'séparer (départager) le vrai (du faux)', on plus brièvement 'faire Maat', peut-être même dans le sens du récit de Diodore, en plaçant l'insigne de la Vérité sur la déposition veridique pour en consacrer le droit;" but there is no independent evidence to support Diodorus' statement.

75.6 There is no evidence of a legal compilation consisting of eight books. As will be seen, a large part of legal suits was apparently submitted in writing, and from the legal documents which have survived it is evident that a written record was kept of court proceedings. By the New Kingdom, a judge was expected to act in accordance with these records: thus in the Installation of a Vizir ch. 8² we read, "See, the magistrate's safeguard is to act in accordance with regulations in doing what has been said." And ch. 18, "And as for the office in which you judge, there is a spacious room in it full of [the records (?) of all (past)] judgements." Although this would not appear to constitute a code of law such as Diodorus must have had in mind, the vizir was obviously expected to be guided by law and precedent—but there is a hint that he might on occasion use his own judgement in ch. 19: "Do not do your (own will) in matters whereof the law is known."

Although criminal cases appear to have been settled by local courts, it is possible that the vizir had access to the criminal archives when necessary; and it is also possible that the records of all

¹ See Daressy, *Statues des Divinités*, I, p. 227; Montet, *Kemi*, IX, p. 32, no. 103, and fig. 22; *ib.*, pl. VIII; *La Necropole royale de Tanis*, I, p. 67 and pl. LVIII; Sotheby sale catalogue, 13.6.1966, p. 38, lot 63 with plate.

² See Faulkner, *JEA*, XLI, 1955, 18-29.

criminal cases throughout the country were filed in a central office.

75.6 There is an excellent example of the legal process of presentation in writing, exactly as it is described by Diodorus, in Thompson, *A Family Archive from Siut*, I. This document of the Ptolemaic period records a court-case in which the plaintiff and defendant alternately present two written documents each to the judges. These are examined by the court, and a decision is given. This is, however, a civil case, and it is possible that criminal cases were conducted *viva voce*.

The part played by written statements in cases of earlier periods is uncertain because of the shortage of evidence. Few records of private lawsuits have survived from Pharaonic times. It seems, however, that as early as the Old and Middle Kingdoms, a case was instituted by written complaint, which was followed by the written reply of the defendant. Such is the form of the inscription of Mes.¹ This consists basically of an introduction (of which much is lost), the deposition of the plaintiff, the deposition of the defendant, the evidence of sworn depositions and documents, followed by the verdict (which is lost). And in the tomb of Rekhmirē', we find a reference to "... the action which any petitioner is taking in writing."² It may be argued that this refers only to the court of the vizir and the XVIIIth Dyn., but it probably had a wider application.

On the other hand, we possess an example of the simplest possible form of the proces-verbal in the fourth document edited by Gardiner, in *ZAS*, XLIII, 27-47.³ This consists of the date, introduction of the plaintiff, deposition of the plaintiff, deposition of defendant, a brief verdict and the names of the judges and witnesses present. There is an absence of any evidence apart from the speeches of the litigants, and the admissions of the defendant under oath must therefore have revealed his guilt.

It appears that there was a direct line in the use of written docu-

¹ Gardiner, *Untersuchungen*, IV, 3.

² Davies, *Rekh-mi-rē'*, I, p. 92, l. 21.

³ For a fragment of M.K. date cf. P. Kahun, II, 1. (Griffith, *Hieratic Papyri from Kahun and Gurob*, pl. XIII; Sethe, *Ägyptische Lesestücke*, 91-2; cf. Théodorides, in *Revue Internationale des droits de l'antiquité*, VI, 1959, 118f.).

ments in court procedure between the New Kingdom and the Ptolemaic period. In Ptolemaic times, a written petition was addressed in the first instance to a higher official, or even to the king himself.¹ An official would then attempt to bring about a settlement, and only if this failed was the case sent to the standing court.

CHAPTER 76

76.1 In general it appears to be true that there were no advocates in Egypt. Legal records are full of such statements as "X spoke in his own voice and said . . .", and there is certainly no evidence anywhere of the use of advocates actually in court. Diodorus must therefore be accepted as correct on this point.²

As a class, advocates first appear in the Ptolemaic period, presumably under Greek influence, when they were organized corporatively, and had their fees regulated by the state.³ However, some sort of representation was known even before the Ptolemaic period, but it is probable that this was undertaken by specialized scribes who would simply help with the preparation of written depositions.⁴

CHAPTER 77

77.2 The oath was commonly used in Egyptian law-courts as in modern ones to ensure that the evidence given was truthful. The evidence for such oaths is collected by Wilson, "The Oath in Ancient Egypt", *JNES*, VII, 1948, 129-156. From the examples given, it appears that the mere taking of an oath was not in itself sufficiently binding. At an early date when the gods were taken seriously, an oath must have been a serious matter: but under the late New Kingdom, the only period for which the evidence is adequate, it became common to add the sanction of a specified punishment for

¹ Seidl, *Ägyptische Rechtsgeschichte der Saiten- und Perserzeit*, p. 38.

² Seidl, *Einführung in die ägyptische Rechtsgeschichte bis zum Ende des neuen Reiches*, p. 35.

³ Taubenschlag, *The Law of Greco-Roman Egypt in the Light of the Papyri*, p. 507.

⁴ Théodoridès, "The Concept of Law in Ancient Egypt", in the new *Legacy of Egypt*, ed. Harris.

perjury. Clearly the fear of human vengeance had become more powerful than that of divine.

In many instances, the witness or defendant was prepared for examination by beating before the administration of the oath, to place him in a receptive frame of mind. The punishment for perjury was decided by the court and varied for different witnesses. It was generally included as part of the oath, the witness swearing to undergo certain penalties if he failed to tell the truth. The punishment might be simply beating, or mutilation (generally the cutting off of the nose and/or ears), or being "placed upon the stake" (killed by being impaled), or any combination of these, or even all three together.¹ Men might be banished to service abroad, especially in Ethiopia, or they could be thrown to the crocodiles.² The punishment for women might be mutilation or banishment to the servants' quarters. A British Museum stele (no. 589), moreover, reads "I am a man who swore falsely by Ptah, Lord of Truth, and he caused (me) to behold darkness by day."

Černý, *Mélanges Maspero*, I, i, 233ff. edits a document dating probably from the XXIst Dyn., in which there occurs an apparent oath (though in an elipsed form), the foreswearing of which is to entail the cutting-out of the perjurer's tongue. This is the only known instance of such a punishment, although Diodorus mentions it in ch. 78.3 as the penalty for the disclosure of military secrets.

Obviously not all perjurers were punished with death, and one wonders whether the aspect of impiety was not perhaps less important than Diodorus claims.³

77.3 There is little evidence that failure to lodge information was regarded as a crime and punished as such. According to the Nauri decree of Sety I,⁴ a legal punishment was prescribed for any official who received a report of violation of the decree but failed

¹ P. Abbott, 5, 5-8; Peet, *Tomb Robberies*, p. 40.

² P. Brit. Mus. 10335, v. 7-9, 16-17, see *JNES*, VI, 158, and n. 17; Blackman, "Oracles in Ancient Egypt", *JEA*, XI, 1925, 249-55.

³ On the other hand, the Decree of Neferhotpe 1.5f. threatens him who commits a positive act of sacrilege with burning, his ashes then to be scattered (Kees, *Kulturgeschichte*, p. 223).

⁴ Griffith, *JEA*, XIII, 1927, 193-208; Edgerton, *JNES*, VI, 1947, 219-230.

to take action. But a citizen failing to report formally such violations was threatened only with the vengeance of the god: "to wipe out his name, to destroy his soul and to prevent his corpse from resting in the necropolis." Presumably the negligence of an official could be legally proved and punished, while the negligence of a private individual was easily concealed. There is, however, no information about the punishment suffered by those who failed to bring an action against bandits in particular.

As far as the use of limited starvation as a punishment is concerned, the nearest approach to this can be found in Spiegelberg, *Studien und Materialien zum Rechtswesen des Pharaonenreiches*, p. 78f.: "Sie schwur bei Gott mit den Worten: Bei P3-r' etc., wenn man ihn mir nimmt, so will ich nicht essen und nicht trinken sondern zur Stande sterben."

77.4 There is too little evidence to determine the punishment suffered by those who laid false accusations. An ostracon from Cairo of the XIXth Dyn. records one case of alleged blasphemy:¹ the chief of workmen was accused by some of his subordinates of this offence. But when examined by the tribunal, the accusers were forced to admit that their charge was false. They were thereupon made to swear an oath not to repeat the accusation on pain of mutilation, and were sentenced to one hundred blows of the stick.

A possible case of false accusation also occurs in the tomb robbery papyri:² the mayor Peser insists on the guilt of the copper-smiths, but the latter are judged innocent by a court of which Peser is one of the judges. But it is unknown what penalty, if any, Peser suffered for his apparently false accusation. In the same trial there occurs a statement which suggests the possibility that in certain situations one man might suffer the penalty of another, but the circumstances are not those given by Diodorus: "As Amūn endures, and as the Ruler endures, should there be found a man who was with me, and whom I have concealed, his punishment is to be carried out upon me."³

¹ Černý, "Quelques ostraca hiératiques inédites de Thèbes au Musée du Caire", *ASAE*, XXVII, 1927, 183-210, esp. 200-205.

² P. Abbott, 7; Peet, *Tomb Robberies*, p. 42.

³ P. Brit. Mus. 10052, 2; 14-16; Peet, *op. cit.*, p. 144.

77.5 Again, there is no evidence that the Egyptians were forced to declare to magistrates their sources of income. There is, however, evidence that business transactions were ratified by local judicial authorities, particularly at a later date in Egyptian history.¹ Such ratifications were obviously kept for many years by the parties involved, and it may be this which Diodorus has in mind.

However, Mallet, *Les premiers établissements des Grecs en Égypte*, p. 370f., says of this regulation covering false declarations, "Elle (sc. cette loi) n'existait pas du reste en Égypte sous la forme que semble lui prêter Hérodote . . . ce qui existait et dès la plus haute antiquité, c'était le cadastre et aussi les recensements périodiques de la population nécessaires pour fixer la quotité et assurer la perception des impôts. On voit souvent, sur les monuments, de longues rangées d'individus défilant devant un scribe, qui enregistre leurs noms, en indiquant la taxe que chacun d'eux doit acquitter. Les Grecs pouvaient assister personnellement à ces scènes, que nous ne connaissons qu'en peinture; on conçoit qu'elles leur aient donné l'idée d'une loi analogue à celle qui fut en vigueur à Athènes." Taubenschlag, *Law of Greco-Roman Egypt*, p. 464, believes that the penalty in Ptolemaic times and later for making a false income-tax return was a fine.

Herodotus, II, 177 also says that Solon was responsible for bringing this law, instituted by Amasis, to Athens; but Plutarch, *Solon*, 31, attributes a similar law to Peisistratus. There is in fact no definite evidence that Solon ever visited Egypt, nor is it likely that any of his legal reforms were of Egyptian origin.

77.6 In the Ptolemaic period at least, distinction was made between premeditated and unpremeditated murder, and between violent homicide and poisoning.² The papyri unfortunately give no positive information of the punishment for murder, but in the normal course of events it was probably death.³ In the case of premeditated murder, in all probability the defendant's property

¹ Gardiner, *ZAS*, XLIII, 27-47.

² Taubenschlag, *op. cit.*, p. 431.

³ For an earlier date see Revillout, *Cours de droit égyptien*, I, p. 23: "Celui qui tue, on le tuera; celui qui ordonne de tuer, on le tuera de même." (Entretien philosophique du chacal Koufi et de la chatte éthiopienne.)

was confiscated as a secondary penalty, as in Attic law. By the IInd century A.D. murder was punished by voluntary exile; by the IVth century, murder in rage was punished by *damnatio in metallum*, common murder by crucifixion. The right of prosecution lay with the family of the victim, but in the case of the murder of an official, the state could intervene.

77.7 Erman, *Ägypten*, p. 204, suggests that this supposed penalty for infanticide is more likely to be a refinement invented by the Greeks than an actual penalty inflicted by the Egyptians. This might in turn suggest that if the Greeks were free to invent one, there may well have been no specified punishment for infanticide. There is in any case no further evidence on the subject.

Neither is there any evidence for the penalty for parricide, which Diodorus himself calls extraordinary, in Egypt. However, John Masters in his autobiography, *Bugles and a Tiger*, p. 211, notes that the Pathans practised a form of torture known as the "death of a thousand cuts", which involved pushing grass and thorns into each wound as it was made. A similar form of torture seems to have been known in China, and that being so, there is no reason why it should not have been known in Egypt, although it is not attested. Since the punishment apparently ended in being burnt alive, perhaps it may be compared with the similar punishment for adultery,¹ which however seems to belong to a very early period.

77.10 The belief that the child was created equally by both parents appears to belong to late Egyptian thought. P. Jumilhac, XII, 24, ed. Vandier, p. 124, reads: "Et Rē dit à l'Énéade: 'Quant à ses chairs et à sa peau, sa mère <les> a créés avec son lait; quant à ses os <ils existent> grâce à la semence de son père. Aussi qu'on s'éloigne de lui sa peau et ses chairs, ses os restant en sa possession'."²

Aspects of P. Jumilhac appear to go back to the New Kingdom,

¹ See above ch. 59.3 and below ch. 78.4.

² Cf. Plutarch, *De libidine et aegritudine*, 6: ἐν τῇ περὶ τὸν Ὠρον ὑπ' Αἰγυπτίων μυθολογουμένη διανομῇ, δικάσαντός τινος τῶν παλαιότερων θεῶν, ἐπεὶ τῷ πατρὶ τιμωρῶν ἀπέκτεινε τὴν μητέρα, [ὁ δικάσας] τὸ αἶμα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν μυελὸν κατέλιπε, περιεῖλε δὲ τὴν πιμελὴν καὶ τὰς σάρκας, ὥς τούτων ἐν τῇ μητρὶ τὴν σύστασιν λάβοντων, ἐκείνων δ' ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς κατὰ γένεσιν εὐέντων αὐτῷ. (Hopfner, *Fontes Historiae Religionis Aegyptiacae*, II, p. 266.).

but the earliest Egyptian mention of this sort dates from the reign of Darius I. The Greek evidence is earlier: Hippon of Samos believed that bones developed in the foetus from the seed of the father, flesh from the mother. But it is possible that there was an earlier Egyptian source for this theory.¹

CHAPTER 78

78.1f. The penalty for desertion, disgrace, is reminiscent of Plato, *Laws*, XII, 943. Whether it was enforced in Egypt is not known. Certainly in the case of the mass desertion of the army under Psammetichus, recorded by Diodorus in ch. 67, no mention is made of any possible punishment for the deserters. Moreover, the term *παρρησία* used by Diodorus had connotations for the Greek which it could not have had for the Egyptian: it may be said to symbolize the ideal of Greek freedom and democracy, and it implied the ability of each citizen to speak and be listened to with respect by his fellow citizens. In this sense the word would be meaningless for an Egyptian.

78.3 For the cutting out of the tongue as the punishment for the betrayal of military secrets, see above ch. 77.2.

78.3 The cutting off of a limb was a fairly common punishment in ancient Egypt,² but whether or not it was the specific penalty for giving false measure has not been established. Ptolemaic law established the death-penalty for those who falsified weights and measures, but there is no evidence that this penalty either was enforced before Ptolemaic times.³

However, the death penalty was also established for forging official documents in the Ptolemaic era,⁴ and that the same punishment was inflicted at an earlier date is definitely attested by the Instruc-

¹ See J. Yoyotte, "Les os et la semence masculine: à propos d'une théorie physiologique égyptienne", *BIFAO*, LXI, 1962, 139-146; see also S. Sauneron, "Le germe dans les os", *BIFAO*, LX, 1960, 17-27. But see also below ch. 80, 3-4, for a slightly different viewpoint.

² As indeed until recently in the Near East: thus a convicted thief might have his right hand lopped off.

³ Taubenschlag, *Law of Graeco-Roman Egypt*, p. 554.

⁴ Taubenschlag, *op. cit.*, p. 464.

tion of Amenemope 21.9, where the advice to a clerk in a magistrate's office is, "Do not make for thyself false documents; they are a great treason (worthy) of death."¹

78.4 Adultery could be grounds for divorce in Ptolemaic times,² but since divorce was achieved simply by separation without any necessity for giving a reason, this is not of great significance. There are instances in Egyptian literature which suggest that the penalty for adultery on the part of a wife was death by burning³; and in general the punishment for adultery does seem to have been death. This is attested by P. Prisse, 9, 7-13: "If thou desirest to make friendship last in a home to which thou hast access as master, as a brother or as a friend, into any place where thou mightest enter, beware of approaching the women . . . one is made a fool by limbs of fayence, as she stands (there), become (all) carnelian. A mere trifle, the likeness of a dream—and one attains death through knowing her."⁴

The one with whom adultery was committed appears generally, at least in Ptolemaic times, to have been outside the law. However, a member of an association of priests could be fined heavily for committing adultery with the wife of a fellow-member, and could be expelled from the association.

CHAPTER 79

79.1 Although the law of contract was attributed to Bocchoris,⁵ Seidl suggests that the account given here accords better with the

¹ Griffith, *JEA*, XII, 218.

² Seidl, *Ptolemäische Rechtsgeschichte*, p. 177.

³ See above ch. 59.3; Pestman, *Marriage and Matrimonial Property*, p. 55, n. 6.

⁴ The Instruction of the vizir Ptahhotpe, in Pritchard, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, p. 412f. Cf. also the Instruction of Ani, III, 13ff. (Pritchard, p. 419): "Be on thy guard against a woman from abroad, who is not known in her (own) town. Do not *stare at* her when she passes by. Do not know her carnally: a deep water, whose windings one knows not, a woman who is far away from her husband. 'I am sleek', she says to thee every day. She has no witnesses when she waits to ensnare thee. It is a great crime (worthy) of death, when one hears of it . . ."

⁵ He was responsible for the introduction of written pleadings, in the opinion of Griffith, based on the demotic papyri of the John Rylands Library in Manchester.

XXIst Dyn. than with a later date¹: the oath in loan documents is assumed to be a *naturale negotii* only in hieratic and early demotic documents, not in the later ones. Nevertheless, Taubenschlag assumes that this provision of the code of Bocchoris was still in force in Ptolemaic times.²

The Egyptian attitude to the acknowledgement of a debt was based on the principle that once the creditor had shown his confidence in another by lending him money, the court was bound to show no less confidence in the debtor than the creditor, and his word was therefore to be trusted. Much emphasis was placed on a man's word in Egypt, and presumably he was trusted not to perjure himself. This system apparently worked, since there are instances where one party refuses to take an oath, and therefore loses the case.³

79.3 There is evidence of the seizure of the person for debt in P. Lansing, 7, 2ff.:⁴ "He (the scribe) registers the harvest-tax, apparitors being after him with staffs and Nehsyu with clubs. One says: 'Give corn!' and there is none. He is beaten furiously. He is bound and thrown into the well; he is soused in headlong dipping, his wife having been bound in his presence. His children are in fetters. His neighbours abandon them and are fled." This records for the XXth Dyn. what is not shown in judicical documents until a later date.

That seizure of the person for debt and subsequent enslavement were not uncommon appears to be confirmed by the explicit references to exceptions which have survived.⁵ It seems to have been abolished at the end of the Ptolemaic era, but personal arrest remained in force, though at a later date this was confined to fiscal debtors. In practice, however, it could also apply to private debtors.

¹ *Ägyptische Rechtsgeschichte der Saiten- und Perserzeit*, (1956), p. 53f.

² *Law of Greco-Roman Egypt*, p. 301.

³ Mattha, "Preliminary Report on the Legal Code of Hermopolis West", *Bull. de l'Inst. d'Égypte*, XXIII, 1941, 297-312. For the importance of the oath in Egyptian law, see above ch. 77.2. Cf. Kunkel, *Griechische und ägyptische Elemente in Eidesrecht der Ptolemäerzeit*, n. 103.

⁴ Caminos, *Late Egyptian Miscellanies*, p. 390. Cf. also P. Anastasi, V, 16, 5ff. (Caminos, p. 247).

⁵ Taubenschlag, *op. cit.*, p. 528ff.

79.5 The law which Solon is reputed to have brought to Athens from Egypt is the famous *σεισαχθεία* or "shaking off of burdens", by which in 594 B.C. he freed all men enslaved for debt, and cancelled all debts involving any form of enslavement. He cannot in fact have introduced it from Egypt, since according to Herodotus, I, 29-30, Solon visited Egypt to escape any repercussions from his legislation and stayed there during the reign of Amasis. Amasis, however, did not come to the throne until 570 B.C.

CHAPTER 80

80.1 Diodorus' account of a guild of thieves, as it were, is extraordinary, and needless to say there is no evidence to support it.

In Ptolemaic times, a distinction was made between theft and robbery: theft involved a civil claim, although the state might intervene in grave cases. The aim in prosecution was restitution of the stolen property, and the imposition of a penalty, the nature of which is unknown.¹ In cases of robbery the injured person demanded compensation, and an additional public penalty was imposed of confiscation of the offender's estates.

For earlier times there is little evidence. Černý, "Stolen Property in Ramesside Times", *JEA*, XXIII, 1937, 186-189, mentions a case where the convicted thief was ordered to return the stolen property, and to pay in addition a penalty of two or three times its value. It is clear that the person robbed would sometimes renounce his claim to the penalty, possibly in cases where the stolen goods were not found with the thief.

80.3 Comparatively little is known about Egyptian marriage-customs.² Although Diodorus maintains that any man except a priest might take more than one wife, Herodotus, II, 92 states that monogamy was the prevailing custom. This was probably true at least of the poorer classes, although the wealthier classes might afford more than one wife; Ramesses II, for example, had three wives, the last being a Hittite princess married for political reasons.

¹ Taubenschlag, *Law of Greco-Roman Egypt*, p. 452f.

² But see above ch. 27.2.

But although the wife was often buried in the same tomb as her husband, there are no instances in sculpture of a man being shown with more than one wife, and bigamy must have been the exception rather than the rule. Men could, however, take concubines, and these ranked next to the legal wife and her children, even sharing the property after the husband's death. And childless couples would adopt an illegitimate child of the husband as their heir.

In the Ptolemaic period priests were forbidden to marry outside their class: such unions were not regarded as legal marriage, and any offspring were considered to be illegitimate.¹

As far as the exposure of infants is concerned, Taubenschlag, *op. cit.*, p. 138 records that in local law, a father was permitted to expose an unwanted child of either sex. He states further that the Greek custom of bringing up exposed children as slaves was firmly established among the Egyptians soon after the beginning of the Ptolemaic period. Rostovtzeff, *Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*, p. 892, more cautiously says, "One would not be surprised, however, in view of the conditions in which the natives lived, to find the practice of exposing children gradually extending from the Greeks to the natives in general, and to the working-classes in particular." But as he points out (p. 1547), a fragment of Musonius Rufus' treatise, εἰ πάντα τὰ γινόμενα τέκνα θρεπτέον, advocating large families, has been found in Egypt.² And indeed no cases of exposure are found under Roman jurisdiction. Moreover, maintenance of a child was considered a legal duty.³

Certainly all the evidence points to the fact that at least in pharaonic Egypt, the exposure of children was unknown.⁴ If exposure ever was practised, it must have been introduced by the Greeks, and probably enjoyed only temporary support. It seems clear that Ptolemy took over an underpopulated land, and presumably anything which might curb the population further could hardly be encouraged.

¹ Taubenschlag, *op. cit.*, p. 109.

² Van Geytenbeek, *Musonius Rufus*, p. 85 suggests that the fact that several historians mention the custom of foreign tribes of bringing up all their children, may indicate an admiration for this custom.

³ Taubenschlag, *op. cit.*, p. 142.

⁴ Cf. Strabo, XVIII, 2.5.

In cases of intermarriage between Greeks and Egyptians children took their father's nationality and status. Thus the children of a Greek man and an Egyptian wife would be regarded as Greek. (Later, however, marriage between a Roman and an Egyptian was regarded as *iniustum* and the children were Egyptian). But although the powers of the father were far-reaching, he could not give away any child for service, adoption or marriage without its mother's consent. The Greek law which recognized as a slave the child of a free man and slave woman appears at an early date to have superceded the native custom of holding such a child as free and legitimate. In any case, slaves according to Egyptian law could apparently marry free individuals or be adopted by them, so becoming free themselves.¹

From Diodorus' account it must be clear that his information is drawn from a source of the early Ptolemaic period, before the practice of exposing children and the bases of illegitimacy had been established in Egypt by the Greeks.

80.3f. The belief that the father was the sole parent of a child appears to be Greek rather than Egyptian.² The same idea is expressed in Aeschylus, *Eumenides*, 661ff., where Apollo states that the mother is not the parent, but simply the nurse of the embryo implanted in her.

As far as the sexuality of plants is concerned, W. H. S. Jones writing on Theophrastus, in *CAH*, VII, 289, says, "That dates are fertilized was known to the Greeks from early times, and Theophrastus describes the process at some length, comparing it to the caprification of figs. The true sexual nature of plants, however, was not yet known. Species, plants and flowers have sex ascribed to them, but generally in a metaphorical sense, 'male' being equivalent to 'barren' and 'female' to 'fertile'." Why Diodorus should say that the opposite was true of the Egyptians, it is difficult to imagine.³ The names for trees, plants and fruits occur in both masculine and

¹ Théodorides, *Revue Internationale des droits de l'antiquité*, XII, 1965, 79-142, particularly 123f.

² Cf. above ch. 77.9, which seems to record the Egyptian point of view.

³ Unless it is his assumption, based on Herod., II, 35f.

feminine forms in Egyptian; but it is true that in some cases the genders are the opposite of their Greek counterparts.

CHAPTER 81

81.1 There were three kinds of Egyptian writing: hieroglyphic, hieratic, and demotic. Of these Diodorus does not distinguish between the first two. Hieroglyphic was the true "sacred" writing, and was used for religious purposes throughout the entire span of Egyptian civilization.¹ Hieratic was a cursive form of this, and was used for secular purposes. This finally gave rise to demotic, a more abbreviated script, which was in general use from about 700 B.C. onwards.

81.2 Herodotus, II, 109 gives the same reason for the invention of geometry.² But in fact, as in the case of astronomy, Egyptian knowledge in the mathematical field was more limited than the Babylonian, and it is more probable that influence in the Greek world came from the latter rather than the former.³ The Egyptians appear to have had a certain amount of knowledge in the practical application of mathematics, but their grasp of the theoretical side fell far short of that of the Greeks.

81.4ff. It is clear that Diodorus is confusing astronomy and astrology. The former was known in Egypt at an early date, the latter not until much later.

As far as it is possible to judge from the limited evidence, observations of the stars were first made in Babylon and Egypt at around the same time, and with fairly primitive results. Certainly in Babylon no scientific astronomy was possible before the VIIIth century B.C., because there was no exact system of chronology. Not until the Assyrian period does an attempt at mathematical description

¹ Classical accounts of Egyptian hieroglyphs are summarized by Budge, *The Mummy*, (2nd ed.), p. 127-137. See also Sottas and Drioton, *Introduction à l'étude des hiéroglyphes*, p. 69-84, 85-96.

² Cf. Servius, *Ad Verg. Ecl.*, III, 41.

³ Neugebauer, *The Exact Sciences in Antiquity*, p. 151, suggests the possibility of "a diffusion of mathematical knowledge from the Near East to Greece in a period close to the eve of the Macedonian offensive against the Persian Empire."

become apparent, and only in the last three centuries B.C. do we find a consistent mathematical theory of astronomy in Mesopotamia. And by this time, Greece, which originally owed much to the science of the East, was far outstripping her teacher in this field.¹

In spite of Diodorus' eulogy of Egyptian astronomy, it is true to say that it had virtually no influence on the outside world, remaining throughout its history on a relatively crude level. In contrast with Babylonian astronomy, even at a late date, star observation in Egypt bore practically no relation to the mathematical astronomy of the Hellenistic age. Only in the field of the calendar can the Egyptians be said to have exerted any influence on the Hellenistic astronomers.²

The astronomical records to which Diodorus refers are probably the Decans, the Greek name given to the stars or groups of stars by which the Egyptians measured the hours of the night. Each Decan represented 10° of the ecliptic, based on the decimal arrangement of the calendar.³ These star clocks show the sky, with the decanal constellations, arranged in thirty-six columns (of ten days each) with twelve lines representing the hours of the night: the user would then be able to tell the hour of the night by the rising of the Decan listed in the appropriate decade of the month.

Representations of star clocks have been found on coffin lids dating from the Middle Kingdom, probably copied from tomb or temple ceilings.⁴ From the New Kingdom there are more elaborate monuments, notably the cenotaph of Sety I. From the latter in particular it becomes obvious that the arrangement of astronomical ceiling decorations was largely determined by artistic principles: there was no serious attempt at astronomical accuracy, and as a result it becomes impossible to identify the constellations.

Unfortunately the decanal clocks retained their usefulness for no more than a few centuries. Tied to the civil year of 365 days (by the addition of a set of constellations for the epagomenal days), like the calendar they failed to take into consideration the fact that the

¹ Cumont, *Astrology and Religion*, p. 25.

² See above ch. 50.1.

³ For an explicit account of the Decans, see Neugebauer, *op. cit.*, ch. IV; Parker and Neugebauer, *Egyptian Astronomical Texts*, I-III.

⁴ Cf. above ch. 49.5.

year is $365\frac{1}{4}$ days long, and as a result the heliacal rising of a Decan soon became out of step with its date in the civil calendar. Brief and fruitless attempts were made to counteract this disruption. However, Egyptian conservatism was such that the Decans were included in the decoration of astronomical ceilings, until their association with the zodiac in the Hellenistic period restored their power as influential elements in astrology.

Astrology as such was unknown in pharaonic Egypt. It seems to have been imported into Egypt from Mesopotamia probably from the time of the Persian period onward, although astrological papyri do not appear before the IIInd century B.C.¹ In Mesopotamia itself astrology was known much earlier, at least in the form of generalized predictions affecting the king and country; but even here the earliest known horoscope is cast for the year 410 B.C.² And although the original impetus for horoscopic astrology must have come from Babylon (albeit with the occasional addition of material from Egypt), the casting of personal horoscopes appears to have been a spontaneous development of the Hellenistic era.

81.7 For wrestling and music, see above ch. 16.

CHAPTER 82

82.1 The theory of residues belongs to the Cnidian school of medicine, founded by Euryphron³; but it is unknown whether his theories were obtained from a written source or by hearsay. The concept of *perittoma* and its underlying ideas of putrefaction remained dominant in Greek medicine until the medical school of Cos, under Hippocrates, achieved a position of importance. This heralded

¹ The earliest known horoscopes in Egypt, however, cannot be dated before the reign of Augustus (Neugebauer, *op. cit.*, p. 168). See further Cumont, *L'Égypte des Astrologues*, (p. 17); *Astrology and Religion*, p. 42-56.

² Neugebauer, *op. cit.*, p. 187, n. ad 69. Proclus, *In Plat. Tim.*, III, 151 (Diehl) quotes Theophrastus as saying that the Chaldaeans could predict in his time not only weather, but also the life and death of people. And of this art Eudoxus (ap. Cicero, *Div.*, II, 42, 87) is earlier recorded to have said *Chaldaeis in praedictione et in notatione cuiusque vitae ex natali die minime esse credendum*.

³ Cf. *Anonymi Londinensis Iatrica*, IX, 37ff., where an Egyptian origin for the concept is suggested. See also above p. 30.

a new era of Greek aetiology based on the concept of elemental humours.¹ But it seems clear that Egyptian medicine was widely known and influential in the Eastern Mediterranean.²

It was known that putrefaction begins in the large intestine: the decomposition of a corpse was the manifestation of organic destruction, associated with the production of heat and odour. To the Egyptians it was obviously sensible to eliminate the putrefactive material by purges and careful dieting. Embalming also was considered a therapeutic process, preventing the physical destruction of the body as the physician allays disease by eliminating the putrefactive material. Indeed, the same word, *sdwh*, means "to embalm", and in medical contexts "to treat."³

82.3 Nothing is known of payment for medical services from the Egyptian texts. But the chief physician at Deir el-Medina was employed to treat the workmen, which suggests that there may have been some medical service for the poor.⁴

There is no evidence in the texts to suggest that a doctor could be penalized for failing to follow a written medical code. And yet Aristotle, *Politics*, III, 10, says the same: ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ μετὰ τὴν τετρήμερον κινεῖν ἔξεστι τοῖς ἰατροῖς τὸν νόμον ἐγγράφον, καθ' ὃν τὰς θεραπειὰς προσάγουσιν, ἅν δὲ πρότερον, ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτοῦ κινδύνῳ. But this may perhaps be the result of some confusion in the mind of a Greek traveller in Egypt. The three-day period here mentioned may be the three days which elapsed before a body was handed over to the embalmers, especially as the Egyptians used the same word for "embalm" and "treat."

However, it does seem certain that there was some written lore for doctors. It has not survived as such, but there are references to it in Clement, *Stromata*, VI, 37.3; and Horapollo, I, 38 says the book was called Ambres. The medical papyri which have come down to us consist of both monographs (e.g. on wounds, gynaecological com-

¹ Steuer and Saunders, *Ancient Egyptian and Cnidian Medicine*.

² Sigerist, *History of Medicine*, I, p. 356ff.

³ Saunders, *Transitions from Ancient Egyptian to Greek Medicine*. See also Grapow etc., *Grundriss der Medizin des alten Ägypter*, II: Grapow, *Von den medizinischen Texten*, p. 1ff.

⁴ See *Grundriss*, III: Grapow, *Kranker, Krankheiten und Arzt*, p. 99.

plaints etc.), and collections of or excerpts from monographs dealing with diseases of a single organ, such as the heart.¹

CHAPTER 83

83.2 Herodotus, II, 65 gives a similar account. There may be some connection between this and the custom described in ch. 18, where Diodorus says that travellers grew their hair when abroad, and only shaved it off on their return to Egypt.

According to Erman and Ranke, *Ägypten und ägyptischen Leben im Altertum*, p. 244ff., all classes of men shaved their heads in Egypt, and all except the priests and the lower classes wore wigs of human hair or vegetable fibre. Children's heads were not totally shaved, as were men's: they were allowed to retain certain locks of hair. The single lock on the side of the head was a sign of childhood, and the divine child Harpocrates is invariably shown with it. Aldred, "Hair Styles and History", *Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin*, XV, 1957, no. 6, p. 145, says that in the Amarna period, infants' heads were shaved, minors wore a side lock only, and adolescents are portrayed wearing a short wig (in the case of the princesses).

83.5 Little is known of the ritual of embalming of the sacred animals, except in the case of the Apis Bull.² For this there is the evidence of the Apis Papyrus, a demotic papyrus dating from the Ptolemaic era.³ In the view of Mond and Myers, *The Bucheum*, I, ceremonial burial of the Apis bull was probably not practised on any scale until the XVIIIth Dyn., while mummification was not introduced until still later, probably in the XXVIth Dyn.

The method employed appears to be the second method described by Herodotus: that is, the bull was not eviscerated, but the entrails were treated through the anus. Ostraca which have been discovered show that natron, myrrh and incense were used in the embalming

¹ Sigerist, *op. cit.*, I, p. 298-318; Grapow, *Untersuchungen über die altägyptischen medizinischen Papyri*, *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Ägyptischen Gesellschaft*, XL, no. 1, 1935; XLI, no. 2, 1936.

² See below ch. 84.

³ Spiegelberg, "Ein Bruchstück des Bestattungsrituals der Apisstiere", *ZAS*, LVI, 1920, 1ff.

process, and there is similar evidence in the Apis Papyrus.¹ The second account on the papyrus suggests that the viscera were packed with solid material, as well as being washed, though they were not removed.² The sacred animals were then buried in individual tombs.

In general, animals were not mummified in any number until the Ptolemaic and Roman periods. Cemeteries have been found near the centres of worship of each cult: thus cat cemeteries have been found at Bubastis, Saqqâra, etc.; ibis cemeteries at Hermopolis, Thebes, Memphis, Abydos etc.; and jackals at Siut.³ The mummification seems to have been crude, the animals often being reduced to skeletons before treatment, and a convincing appearance being achieved by skilful bandaging. Smaller animals were not eviscerated, but were treated simply with natron and resin.

83.6f. Herodotus, II, 65 says that the unintentional killing of a hawk or an ibis meant death. Wiedemann, *Herodots zweites Buch*, p. 282, suggests that this varied from nome to nome, depending on which animals were considered sacred locally. But since the hawk and ibis (Horus and Thoth) were held to be sacred throughout most of Egypt, Herodotus is probably substantially correct. Presumably Diodorus includes the cat because he himself saw the incident he describes. This must have happened in a district where the cat was held to be particularly sacred, and it is therefore reasonable to assume that Diodorus visited Bubastis.

CHAPTER 84

84.1 For cannibalism, see above ch. 14.1.

84.2 Herodotus, II, 66, also says that the inhabitants of a house where a dog has died shave their heads and the whole of their body. It is possible, but there is no evidence to substantiate the statement. House-dogs (the semi-domesticated "jackals", or wild dogs⁴) were frequently kept in Egypt, but although treated with affection, they

¹ *Bucheum*, II, p. 53ff.

² *Bucheum*, I, p. 64.

³ Hopfner, *Tierkult*: see the index for the burial places of the various animals.

⁴ See below ch. 87.2.

seem not to have been highly regarded. On the other hand, the wild dogs were the sacred animals of Anubis and Wepwawet, and as such would have been held in respect. Thus one cannot entirely dismiss the statements of the Classical authors, even though they appear to be exaggerated.

84.4 Originally the Apis bull was a symbol of fertility. It was sacred to the lunar deity Ptah-Seker-Osiris,¹ god of the necropolis of Memphis and the local form of Osiris; and for this there is abundant evidence in the Egyptian sources.² According to both Diodorus (I, 21) and Strabo (XVII, 1.31), its cult eventually extended to cover the whole of Egypt.

The antiquity of the cult of Apis is well attested: Aelian, XI, 10 attributes its institution to Menes; there is evidence for its existence in the time of Khufu³ and Menkaure⁴, and its priests are first mentioned on a IVth Dyn. sarcophagus.⁵ But the earliest Egyptian evidence is a vase bearing the inscription, "Horus-Aha, first occasion of the Running of Apis";⁶ this refers to the second king of the 1st Dyn., and there are indications that the cult is possibly older.

The Greeks do not name the god originally represented by the Apis, nor the reason for its sanctity. They are, however, in agreement that it was sacred to Osiris.

84.4 The bull Mnevis, according to the Greeks, was dedicated to Osiris, and was the holy animal of the sun. In fact, Mnevis was the incarnation of the sun-god Rē-Atum worshipped at Heliopolis, capital of the XIIIth Lower Egyptian nome.⁷ The evidence for Mnevis is not as old as that for the Apis: it is attested for the XIIth Dyn., and is mentioned in the Book of the Dead of the XVIIIth Dyn., and also in the Turin Canon.

¹ See below ch. 85.1. Cf. Porphyry ap. Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.*, 3.13.1f., who says that Mnevis was sacred to the sun, Apis to the moon.

² Otto, *Stierkulte*, p. 27ff. Both the living and dead Apis bulls were regarded as incarnations of Osiris, expressed in the form of the names Apis-Osiris and Osiris-Apis. From the latter name comes the form Sarapis.

³ Lepsius, *Denkmaeler*, II, 17b.

⁴ Lepsius, *op. cit.*, II, 37b.

⁵ Cairo, No. 964; Lepsius, *op. cit.*, II, 16.

⁶ Vercontter, *Textes biographiques du Serapéum de Memphis*, p. xxi.

⁷ For Atum as the "Bull of Heliopolis", see Brugsch, *Geogr. Inschr.*, I, 257, Taf. 47 (1244); cf. Pyr. 716; Otto, *Stierkulte*, 38.

84.4 The goat-cults mentioned by the Classical authors were in fact ram-cults, although the Egyptians themselves seem to have confused the two animals. For the Greeks the goat was the animal of Dionysus and Pan, and the identification of the Egyptian ram-god with Pan helped the confusion.

Mendes was the Egyptian god Khnum-Rē', under the Lower Egyptian local name Ba-neb-dedu, "The Ram, the Lord of Djedu (Busiris)." The chief centre of the cult was at Busiris, more usually called Mendes. Khnum-Rē' was important in Lower and Middle Egypt as the local form of the creative sun-god, the ram being a fertile animal.

84.4 The "crocodile of Lake Moeris" is a reference to Sobek, the most important crocodile god. Strangely enough he is hardly mentioned by name in the Classical authors, except by Strabo, XVII, 1.38, where he appears under the name Suchus; but the name is here applied to the animal, not to the god.

The best known site of worship of the crocodile god was Crocodilopolis in the Fayûm, but a variety of places claimed this distinction. Wherever Sobek was worshipped one or more sacred crocodiles were kept. Most of these were regarded not as incarnations of the god (as were Apis and Mnevis), but as animals sacred to the god.¹

84.4 Strabo, XVII, 1.40 also refers to the lion worshipped in Leontopolis, and Kees, *Ancient Egypt*, p. 155, says that a pair of lions were kept there.

There are at least two sites in Lower Egypt which were called Leontopolis: one lies north-east of Heliopolis, where a pair of lions were held in honour because of their association with Shu and Tefnut of the Heliopolitan cosmogony; the other site is near Tell Muqdam, and is particularly noted for its lion objects of the Ptolemaic or Persian period.²

84.5 As far as sacred enclosures are concerned, the evidence of the later authors³ suggests that in some cases the sacred animals

¹ See above ch. 35.6, and below ch. 89.1.

² De Wit, *Le rôle et le sens du lion dans l'Égypte ancienne*, p. 423ff.

³ Strabo, XVII, 1.31; Lucian, *Imag.*, 11; Clement, *Paedag.*, III, 2; Celsus, in Origen, III, 17; VI, 80.

were introduced into the temple buildings or into the enclosure, but that generally they were left in a separate place except when ritual required their presence.

There is little evidence of the treatment of the sacred animals, or of the ritual attached to their cult. That there was a priestly hierarchy attached to the sacred animals is confirmed by the papyri,¹ and offerings and libations were certainly made to them. The slightly higher average length of life of the sacred bulls at later stages of Egyptian history suggests that they were probably better cared for.² Normally the animals lived in the temple precincts until their natural death.

84.8 For Ptolemy's loan towards the funeral expenses of the Apis see Bevan, *History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty*, p. 183. The precise date of death of this Apis bull is not known, but must presumably have occurred some time around 320 B.C.³ It seems probable that the king also made fixed contributions to the services in the great temples.⁴

CHAPTER 85

85.1 As has been said, the Apis bull was closely connected not only with Osiris, but also with Ptah.⁵ Both were worshipped at Memphis, and the Apis bull was considered sacred in the temple of Ptah in the Old Kingdom. There was, however, no further connection until the XVIIIth Dyn., when the Apis cult needed an associa-

¹ Hopfner, *Tierkult*, p. 16f. There were also special embalmers for the sacred animals (*op. cit.* p. 21f.).

² Vercoutter, "Une épitaphe royale inédite du Sérapéum", *MDAIK*, XVI, 1958, p. 340.

³ See Murray, "Hecataeus of Abdera and Pharaonic Kingship", *JEA*, LVI, 1970, p. 143. I cannot agree with Murray that this passage in Diodorus "ought to suggest that no later Apis bull had yet died when Hecataeus made these statements", suggesting that this passage of Diodorus is lifted straight from Hecataeus. Far more probable is it, to my mind, that Diodorus has chosen one specific example of expenditure to prove the point he is making, particularly as his final sentence cannot come from Hecataeus. Certainly one can scarcely use this passage to establish the date of Hecataeus' composition.

⁴ Bevan, *op. cit.*, p. 28ff.

⁵ See Sandman Holmberg, *The God Ptah*, p. 196ff.; Otto, *Stierkulte*, p. 15ff.

tion with a powerful cult in the neighbourhood. In the XIXth Dyn. the bull was called "Apis, Ptah's living son and intermediary." The priests of Ptah seem to have had charge of the Apis, especially during the funeral, although the king had the right of control in the ceremony.

On the death of the Apis¹ a new incarnation was sought from the Delta to Thebes. The new Apis was apparently born immediately after the death of its predecessor,² and was recognized by its colouring and markings.³ Its discovery brought good fortune to the place where it was found and was the sign for great rejoicing. Aelian, XI, 16 confirms Diodorus' account of the new Apis' journey to Memphis, and says that the calf was fed on milk for four months in a temporary home before being taken to Memphis by boat. The new Apis appears never to have been less than nine months old when it was enthroned, and the ceremony must have been linked with the appearance of the sexual potentiality of the bull, which only develops after it is nine months old.

Diodorus' statement that only women could look upon the Apis⁴ for the forty days which it spent in Nilopolis before continuing its journey to Memphis, is not elsewhere substantiated. It is possibly true, however, since the Apis represented creative force. It is unlikely that they were then barred from entering its presence again, and there is certainly no evidence of this. But the statement may be based on a misconception, since the Serapeum was apparently kept shut, except after the death of the Apis.⁵ Certainly in Strabo's day the Apis was on view to the public, since the geographer saw both it and its mother.⁶

¹ Chassinat, "La mise à mort rituelle d'Apis", *Rec. Trav.*, XXXVIII, 1916, 33-60, suggests that the Apis bull was drowned when it reached the age of 28, or 25 by the time of Plutarch. But no known Apis or Buchis lived to this age (Mond and Myers, *Bucheum*, I, p. 4). There is no evidence for the drowning of the Apis for earlier times; there is, however, some evidence that it was eaten in certain periods.

² Vercoutter, *MDAIK*, XVI, 1958, particularly p. 339ff.

³ Herodotus, III, 28; Strabo, XVII, 1.31; Pliny, VIII, 71.

⁴ Cf. Herodotus, II, 60.

⁵ Pausanias, I, 18: Αἰγυπτίους δὲ ἱερὰ Σαράπιδος ἐπιφανέστατον μὲν ἔστιν Ἀλεξανδρεῦσιν ἀρχαιότατον δὲ ἐν Μέμφει· ἐς τοῦτο ἐσελθεῖν οὔτε ξένοις ἔστιν οὔτε τοῖς ἱερεῦσι, πρὶν ἂν τὸν Ἄπιν θάπτωσι. See also Vercoutter, "Napatan Kings and Apis Worship", *Kush*, VIII, 1960, 62ff.

⁶ Strabo, XVII, 1.31.

Mourning for the dead Apis probably did continue for seventy days, the period of embalming. The death of any sacred animal meant mourning in the nome in which it was worshipped, but in the case of the Apis and Mnevis bulls, the whole of Egypt mourned.

85.2 According to Sethe, *Untersuchungen*, III, 105 and *Urgeschichte*, 109, the Greek Nilopolis was *Pr-H'py* which is always mentioned in conjunction with *Hr-h3* and which lay on the island of Rodah opposite Old Cairo.¹ Gardiner, *Ancient Egyptian Onomastica*, II, p. 139f., refutes this identification, since the Nilopolis of Ptolemy was situated in the Heracleopolite nome. This and a village in the Fayûm near Lake Moeris are the only two definitely located places of this nome, and neither of them has any pharaonic equivalent. But the Nilopolis to which Diodorus refers is probably situated near Memphis and Heliopolis; and since Ha'py is the Nile, Nilopolis could still be considered a translation of *Pr-H'py*; but this is almost certainly to be located at Atar-en-Naby, where remains have now been found of a temple of Ha'py.² But as Gardiner points out, if *Pr-H'py* is located at Atar-en-Naby, it is difficult to equate it with the Egyptian Babylon (which at least at a late date was Old Cairo and included the island of Rodah), though this may still be *Hr-h3*.

The problem then seems to be that although Babylon is Old Cairo, at least in the papyri, and although Babylon seems to be derived from the name *Pr-H'py*, *Pr-H'py* appears now to be located at Atar-en-Naby, and to be the Greek Nilopolis. But the location at Atar-en-Naby is not yet entirely confirmed, so it may be that Babylon and Nilopolis are two names for the same place—not impossible, since the former suggests an Egyptian name, the latter the Greek translation of the Egyptian. Alternatively, since *Pr-H'py* and *Hr-h3* are frequently mentioned together, the former name may have become confused with and eventually replaced the latter in the papyri.

85.5 The derivation of the name Busiris which Diodorus gives here is most interesting. He claims that the name of the city comes

¹ See above ch. 56.3.

² Gardiner, *op. cit.*, II, 131-141.

from βοῦς on the grounds that Isis gathered the scattered members of Osiris into a wooden ox. This etymology is incorrect,¹ but probably owes its existence to the fact that the sky-goddess Nut was regularly depicted on sarcophagi,² and as the universal mother she was frequently represented as a cow.³

However, after the Saite period there are numerous representations on coffins, temples, tombs and head-rests of the Apis bull carrying a mummy to its tomb.⁴ There is also evidence for the conception, which appears to be ancient, of Seth as a bull carrying Osiris. (In this guise he appears not merely as the murderer of Osiris, but also as the one who assists the latter's resurrection.)

The hollow cow definitely plays a part in Osirian ritual: Herodotus, II, 129f., records that Mycerinus buried his daughter in a hollow gilded-wood cow at Sais, and (II, 132) that the image was carried out each year, presumably at the winter solstice when Osiris was mourned.⁵ An even closer analogy with Diodorus' account is to be found in a Dendera text⁶: the Isiac cow used in the Osirian rites was made of sycamore-wood, and was believed to bear within it the mummy of the god.

The tradition that Osiris was buried at Busiris appears to be a late one.⁷ Osiris' earliest associations seem to have been with Abydos, and it is here that the Pyramid Texts suggest that he was buried.⁸ However, he is continually associated with Busiris, where he replaced the local deity, Andjety. An additional factor was that Isis was connected with the neighbouring district of Sebennytos.

But the text of Diodorus is confusing at this point: what city is he actually talking about? The statement about Busiris occurs at the end of a chapter dealing with the entry of the new Apis to the sanctuary of Hephaestus (Ptah) at Memphis. It is impossible to believe that Diodorus is confusing Memphis and Busiris; he must

¹ For the true explanation, see below ch. 88.5.

² Griffiths, *Origins of Osiris*, p. 27f.

³ Cf. also Steph. Byz., s.v. Βούσιρις; Porphyry, *de Abstinencia*, IV, 9.

⁴ See Te Velde, *Seth, God of Confusion*, p. 97.

⁵ Cf. Plutarch, *DIO*, 39 and 52.

⁶ Chassinat, *Le mystère d'Osiris au mois de Khoiak*, I, p. 65f.

⁷ Cf. Plutarch, *DIO*, 21: Εὐδοξος δὲ πολλῶν τάφων ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ λεγομένων ἐν Βουσίριδι τὸ σῶμα κεῖσθαι.

⁸ See above ch. 11.1; Griffiths, *Plutarch*, p. 369.

simply have added this gratuitous piece of information without integrating it fully with what has gone before.

CHAPTER 86

The Egyptian custom of worshipping animals possessed a curious fascination for the Greeks. It was a practice which they found difficult to comprehend, since it played no part in their own religion, which was anthropomorphic from the start. It is true that animals frequently occur in Greek mythology—Zeus might be transformed into a bull or a swan to achieve his ends—but in no case was the animal itself an object of veneration. In addition the Greeks were interested in the limited area of worship of each animal in Egypt. From inscriptions it is clear that each nome had its particular god and sacred animal, a tradition which must stem from the prehistoric period when different branches of the Egyptians used different animals as clan fetishes. But the Greeks were ignorant of such origins. They saw the Egyptians as a single race and found themselves forced to invent reasons to explain the variety of animals honoured in different regions.

The origins of the Egyptian religion are wrapped in obscurity, but the very nature of the country seems to have had some share in the formation of religion. In prehistoric times, Egypt appears to have been occupied by a collection of independent tribes who entered the country at different times, each in all probability worshipping its own god, whose outward form—an animal, tree or other object—was the standard of the clan. This religious individualism, with each locality having its own deity manifest in some animal or object, was never to be crushed. The tribes seem to have settled in villages, and gradually a single village would rise to prominence in its own area. Thus each district, or nome, came to consist of a city surrounded by its dependent villages and territory. Naturally the deity of the city would become pre-eminent, and the attempt of the villages to associate their own deities with that of the city led to the growth of divine families and hierarchies within the nome.

The nature of the deities, however, and the reasons for the aspects under which they were worshipped, are not always clear. On dec-

orated vases of the Naqada period, there occur representations of boats with cabins. On the roof of the cabin there is usually shown a high pole with an object or an animal on top (e.g. mountains, a palm branch, the sun, an elephant, a bird). Since these resemble the divine ensigns of the historical period, it is probable that they are ensigns of prehistoric Egyptian deities. Thus there must already have existed numerous deities to whom cult-objects and animals were already assigned. The object, animate or inanimate, which was the outward form of the deity, must in all probability have been chosen because it conveyed the idea of power, good, ill or mysterious. Thus Vandier, *La religion égyptienne*, p. 15 says, "Le sentiment religieux porte naturellement le fidèle à craindre son dieu parce qu'il est puissant, à l'aimer parce qu'il est utile, à l'admirer enfin parce qu'il ne le comprend pas." The tree was an object of reverence because it gave both shade and fruit, the vulture because of its majesty, the scarab beetle because of the mystery of its existence.

Basically, then, the reason for the worship of animals must have been their ability to inspire fear or awe, or their usefulness for mankind. Hopfner, *Der Tierkult der alten Ägypter*, p. 7, suggests that men saw animals following their instincts, and used them as a warning of future events. They saw this instinct as proof that animals stood higher in grace than men, and for this reason they attributed to some animals the power of speech and thought. This theory of the "otherness" of animals is developed by Frankfort, *Ancient Egyptian Religion*, p. 8-14: in the absence of a general rule and in the variety of animals worshipped, he sees an underlying religious awe in the face of all animal life. He holds that animal worship, far from being merely a survival from a primitive stratum of Egyptian religion, was continually upheld because in Egypt an animal, regardless of its specific nature, seemed to have a religious significance. Whether this is true or not, the Egyptians must have seen in different animals a power either useful and beneficent and thus to be kept favourable towards mankind, or evil and hostile and thus to be continually appeased.

Wiedemann, *Le Muséon*, VI, 113f., suggests that the original inhabitants of Egypt with their worship of inanimate objects and animals were overrun by a race with an anthropomorphic religion.

As a result, the animals were identified with the human gods, the chief animal of each district becoming the incarnation of the main god. However, the idea of a conquering race is not widely accepted, although it is certainly possible that the animal and anthropomorphic gods stemmed from different religions. Thus Stock, *Die Welt des Orients*, I, 3, (1948), 135-145, suggests that the cosmic and anthropomorphic gods which derive mainly from the Eastern Delta show Semitic influence, as opposed to the gods of the Western Delta and Upper Egypt, which stem from African animal worship.¹

Vandier² suggests rather that the gods became humanized in the natural course of events, while preserving their origins in, for example, an animal's head. As Černý, *Ancient Egyptian Religion*, p. 27, observes, it is probable that the step from zoolatry and fetishism to anthropomorphism was the same in Egypt as elsewhere, and was prompted by progressive domination of the animal and material world, combined with a diminishing emphasis on physical qualities. The increasing value placed upon intellectual qualities, more highly developed in man than in animals, made it inevitable that gods should finally take the form of men. Such a change need not have affected all deities or all classes of people at once: it is possible that the higher and more intellectual classes reached the stage of humanization before the rest. Anthropomorphization was probably influenced by the identification of the king with Horus, a practice which dates back at least to the close of the predynastic period.

Jéquier, *Considerations sur les religions égyptiennes*, p. 15f., differs in his reconstruction of the growth of Egyptian religion. He suggests that there occurred three stages in its development before the historic period: fetishism, zoolatry and anthropomorphism, each stage being determined by radical changes in social life and conditions. The early worship of natural objects, such as mountains or large rocks, or anything conveying the idea of power, might be replaced without difficulty by the worship of animals, with the natural change from a nomadic to an agricultural life. The diversity of thought among the separate tribes was then accentuated with

¹ Cf. Griffiths, *Conflict*, p. 144f.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 18ff.

the choice of an animate representative of divine power, which might be beneficent, hostile or indifferent. Jéquier agrees that anthropomorphism probably emanated from the upper classes without imposing itself on the masses. Zoolatry then would be an intermediate stage between the most primitive fetishism and the more sophisticated anthropomorphism.

But it is impossible to differentiate between the three stages as easily as Jéquier suggests. It is possible that fetishism did precede zoolatry in the most primitive stage of religion, but it did not disappear after the introduction of zoolatry. On the contrary, the Naqada vases seem to suggest that both animate and inanimate objects were revered simultaneously as representatives of divine power. And certainly both survived the step towards anthropomorphism. In this way, each new religious concept and each new deity was grafted onto the existing religion without in any way replacing it.

This syncretistic attitude was characteristic of the Egyptians, and was responsible for the complicated structure of their religion. Even after the unification of the country, cults which were to become national (those of Rē, Osiris, Amūn), did not supplant the mosaic of religious beliefs which had their origins in independent tribes, but were superimposed on them. At the same time the gods concerned did not remain unchanged, but drew new attributes from their association with each other.

So when the gods came to be endowed with human form, they still retained their original animal attributes and might be represented as humans with animals' heads, or, as often in the case of Hathor, with a human face but cow's ears and horns. In some cases a single god, by being introduced into two or more nomes venerating different animals, might come to be associated with more than one animal. So Thoth is associated with the ibis and the cynocephalus. Conversely a single animal might represent more than one deity: both Anubis and Wepwawet are shown as jackals. In many cases more than one god was worshipped in each nome, and therefore more than one animal. And the animals attached to the gods who were universally acknowledged were worshipped all over Egypt.

In the Late Period, animal worship increased in popularity out

of all proportion, and most of the countless mummies of every kind of animal date from this period. And so the Greeks, confronted by the worship of numerous animals in different places, were baffled, and sought to explain rationally the practice so alien to their own religious beliefs.

The first explanation which Diodorus gives for the worship of animals is admitted by him to be entirely fabulous: the few gods who originally existed were overpowered by the "earth-born men" (the Giants), and took refuge from their savagery in the forms of animals. These animals were ultimately made sacred by the gods in gratitude for their own survival. This story is not very different from Diodorus' reference in ch. 26 to the battle between the Giants and Osiris. In fact, both chapters seem to be diametrically opposite explanations of a single type of relief, that of a large figure of Horus or Osiris smiting Seth and his followers, usually represented in much smaller proportions and in the form of animals such as crocodiles or hippopotami. Since Seth and his followers were occasionally called Giants by the Classical authors,¹ the version given in ch. 26 is indeed a true explanation. But it is easy to see how a similar relief might be interpreted as showing a Giant (actually Horus, but mistakenly assumed to be Seth/Typhon) attacking a number of animals.

But the basis for Diodorus' statement may well be literary rather than archaeological. Griffiths, "The Flight of the Gods before Typhon", *Hermes*, LXXXVIII, 1960, 374-6, sees in this chapter a reference to a myth which crops up occasionally in the Classical authors, according to which the gods fled to Egypt where they transformed themselves into animals to escape the pursuing Typhon. This must have its origin in the Egyptian myth of the struggle between Horus and Seth, in which the followers of Seth turn themselves into various animals. This presumably was adapted by the Greeks to explain the animal forms of the main Egyptian gods.

Diodorus' second explanation of animal-worship, that the early Egyptians were defeated in battle because of their lack of order until they conceived the idea of standards to which each soldier might rally, is echoed in ch. 90.1. In that chapter men are described as having formed themselves into bands or clans, each with a specific

¹ Hopfner, *Fontes Historiae Religionis Aegyptiacae*, 350, 637, 638.

animal symbol, to protect themselves against stronger neighbours. There is an element of truth in these accounts, particularly the latter, since these standards seem to have represented the gods of the independent tribes.

The final reason which Diodorus gives in the following chapter also contains an element of truth, since animals do appear to have been revered in some cases for their usefulness.

CHAPTER 87

87.1 Cows were indeed used for ploughing, while oxen would be used for heavier tasks, such as drawing sledges loaded with stones.

The cow was originally the sacred animal of Hathor who was widely worshipped as the embodiment of the female power of creation and fruitfulness. With the identification of Isis and Hathor, the cow also became sacred to Isis.¹ The reverence felt for Hathor was extended to all cows, and according to Herodotus, they were not sacrificed.

87.2 Sheep are not often mentioned as objects of worship. Plutarch, *DIO*, 74 and Diodorus both say that they were worshipped because of their use to mankind,² but the Egyptian evidence does not support this theory. If they were venerated, it was probably only as the female equivalent of the sacred ram.

Sheep were kept in large numbers throughout Egyptian history, the original *ovis longipes palaeoaegyptiaca* giving way to the more recent *ovis platyra aegyptiaca*.³ But the only use to which sheep were put appears from the monuments to have been treading the seed into the ground, and threshing the grain. Wool was regarded as unclean and was not used by priests or for mummies, even after foreign influence in the Vth century B.C. made it more popular. Mutton, similarly, was prohibited for the gods, the dead and the priests, although it may well have been eaten by the common

¹ Herodotus, II, 41; above ch. 11.

² Cf. Plutarch, *DIO*, 4; Herod., II, 42, 46; Strabo, XVII, 803.

³ The god Khnum is shown with the head of a ram of *longipes palaeoaegyptiaca* type with wavy horns, Amün with the head of *platyra aegyptiaca* with curly horns.

people.¹ Milk does seem to have played an important part in the diet of men and gods,² but in the reliefs milk is generally shown being drawn from a cow, not from a sheep. It is uncertain whether milk-products were used.

87.2 Although the Greeks distinguished between the dog and the wolf in Egyptian religion, it is probable that only the Egyptian jackal was worshipped.³ This was not the true jackal, which is not found in Egypt, but a smaller relative, *canis lupaster*. Wild-dogs, or half-wild dogs were, and still are prevalent in Egypt, and were often domesticated to act as house-dogs. They were also used for hunting and for war in their wild state.

The Greeks never mention the jackal as a holy animal, but two jackal-gods can be distinguished from the Old Kingdom: Anubis, represented by a recumbent jackal, and Wepwawet, represented by a standing jackal. The Egyptians distinguished only between two postures of the same animal, but the Greeks saw in this evidence of two different animals, the dog and the wolf. With the spread of the cult of Anubis, the "dog" became sacred throughout Egypt; worship of Wepwawet and of the "wolf" was in the main restricted to Siut, called by the Greeks Lycopolis.

Before the rise to prominence of the cult of Osiris, Anubis was the great funerary god. He was thought to be embodied in the jackal which prowled around the necropolis and embalming place, and therefore appeared to be guarding the dead. Anubis took his place in the Osirian cycle as the embalmer of the dismembered Osiris,⁴ and became the patron of embalmers. When the Isiac cult became widespread and popular, Anubis became simply the guardian and companion of Isis. It is possible that the idea that Anubis helped Isis in her search for Osiris grew out of this later development of Anubis' character.⁵ In the procession of Isis, Anubis was represented by a man in a mask, and it is evident that the sight of a priest in

¹ References to offerings of sheep are rare, but they do occur: Kees, *Götterglaube*, p. 73; and *Bemerkungen zum Tieropfer der Ägypter und seiner Symbolik* (Nachr. Göttingen, 1942), p. 76.

² See above ch. 22.

³ Hopfner, *Tierkult*, p. 47; Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar*, p. 471.

⁴ See the coffin of Henui; Steindorff, *Grabfunde des Mittleren Reichs*, II, 17.

⁵ Cf. Aelian, X, 48.

a dog's mask was not uncommon where Isis was worshipped.¹

Numerous mummies of jackals have been excavated, particularly near and in Siut, and at Sheikh el-Fadl, the Greek Cynopolis.

87.4 Cats are frequently mentioned by the Classical authors. The cat was identified with Bastet, a form of Hathor, but who, according to Herodotus, II, 59 and 137, was the Egyptian form of Artemis. The main centre of worship of this goddess was Bubastis (Per-Bastet, "the house of Bastet") in the Eastern Delta.

A wild species of cat is known to have existed in Egypt from prehistoric times. It seems to have been one of these who was the "Great Cat who is in Heliopolis", and who is mentioned in the Book of the Dead as tearing to pieces the evil serpent. In the XXth Dyn. tomb of Anherkau at Thebes, a cat is shown wielding a two-edged blade against a snake, and it is possible that Diodorus saw a similar representation. Alternatively he may be confusing the cat with the mongoose, which even today is kept tame in the house to kill snakes.

The domestic cat first appears in Egypt in the Middle Kingdom, probably brought as a curiosity from the west and south.

87.4 The cult of the ichneumon has been examined by Roeder, "Das Ichneumon in der ägyptischen Religion und Kunst", *Egyptian Religion*, IV, 1936. The ichneumon goddess was Utit² the goddess of Per-Utit on the Sebennytic arm of the Nile in the north-west Delta, called by the Greeks Buto.

There appears to have been some confusion between the shrew-mouse and the ichneumon, and the cults of each are identical. The ichneumon was worshipped particularly in the Delta, but since it must have hindered poultry-breeding by its custom of eating eggs, the basis of its worship lay probably in its sex-life, and not in its usefulness. According to Aelian, X, 47, the animal was both male

¹ Apuleius, *Met.*, XI, 8-17; a Roman, one Volusius, (according to Appian, IV, 47) proscribed by the Second Triumvirate, managed to escape wearing the linen robe and dog's head mask of a priest of Anubis. Presumably, then, the persons of Isiac priests were respected. See Tran Tam Tinh, *Le culte d'Isis à Pompéi*, p. 22. For the masks of Anubis, see Waldemar Klingbeil, *Kopf-Masken- und Maskierungszauber in den antiken Hochkulturen*, p. 93ff., and pl. 27(1).

² Leto, in Aelian, X, 47.

and female; and the goddess Utit appears to have been an aspect of Hathor as the creative principle.

The cult was fairly old, since Amenemhet III of the XIIth Dyn. is mentioned in the Labyrinth as the "beloved of the ichneumon." Mummies of the animal have been found at Tanis, skulls at Bubastis.

The story which Diodorus tells of the method by which the ichneumon killed crocodiles is explained by Léfèbvre, in *Sphinx*, VI, 1903, 189-205: he believes it to be a religious allegory, with the crocodile representing darkness, the ichneumon the sun. Thus the crocodile is the personification of night which devours the sun, which in turn is retrieved from the belly of the animal in the morning. On the other hand, Roeder suggests that the story is the product of a dragoman's imagination. But neither explanation accounts for the extremely factual impression of Diodorus' account, nor does it explain why the ichneumon should have rolled itself over in the mud before leaping into the crocodile's mouth. Strabo, XVII, 1.39 elaborates on the tale, however, and says that the dried mud acts as armour.¹

87.6 Two kinds of ibis are described by Herodotus, II, 76, and he is supported by Aristotle, *Zoology*, IX, 19.6, according to whom the black ibis was worshipped only in Pelusium, the white ibis everywhere except Pelusium. The black ibis, *Falcinellus rufus*, was rarer than the white *Ibis religiosa*, which was common throughout Egypt. There was in addition the crested ibis, which appears as the hieroglyph "to shine" and its derivatives.

The white ibis was regarded as the incarnation of the moon-god Thoth. The ibis cult was known in Egypt before the Pyramid age and the rise of Osirian religion, and there are indications of its existence at Hierakonpolis in the time of Narmer. Hermopolis Magna in Upper Egypt is usually accepted as the main centre of the ibis-cult, but Thoth as an ibis was also worshipped at Hermopolis Parva in the Delta. It is uncertain in which of these two places the cult first arose, although the marshy Delta area might suggest itself as the site of the original ibis-cult.

¹ Cf. also Brunner-Traut, "Spitzmaus und Ichneumon als Tiere des Sonnengottes", *Göttinger Vorträge vom ägyptologischen Kolloquium der Akademie*, am 25-26 August 1964, 123-164.

The reasons for ibis-worship are obscure, although it is true that the bird attacks and eats snakes, insects and reptiles, since their remains have been found in mummified ibises. According to Herodotus, II, 75, the ibis kills the winged serpents which invade Egypt from Arabia each year. This he gives as the Egyptians' own explanation of their worship of the ibis; and bronze figures showing the bird attacking a snake have been found dating from the Roman period.¹

87.6 The hawk or falcon was the sacred bird of Horus.² As early as in the Pyramid Texts he is shown killing dangerous snakes (663ff., Utt. 378): "The sandal of Horus is what tramples the *nḥi*-snake underfoot, the *nḥi*-snake of Horus the young child . . . It is dangerous for me, so I have trodden on you. . ."³

87.8 Like Diodorus, Clement, *Stromata*, VI, 757 identifies the pterophorai and the hierogrammateis: 'Εξῆς δὲ ὁ ἱερογραμματεὺς προέρχεται ἔχων πτερὰ ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς βιβλίον τε ἐν χερσὶ καὶ κανοῦν, ἐν ᾧ τό τε γραφικὸν μέλαν καὶ σχοῖνος ἦ γράφουσι. Gardiner, *Ancient Egyptian Onomastica*, I, p. 56*f., suggests that this accords well with the vignette from a XXIIInd Dyn. coffin.⁴ κανοῦν must somehow mean "palette", and κανόνα, "ruler", has been suggested. It is clearly a lector-priest who is depicted in the vignette, and the feathers on his head recall the term πτεροφόρος.⁵ Moreover, the word for a lector-priest, *hry-hb*, has been shown to mean "he who carries the ritual book".

But the Decree of Canopus⁶ distinguishes between the *hry-hb* and the *sš pr-nḥ* (scribe of the House of Life),⁷ in Greek the πτεροφόραι and the ἱερογραμματεῖς.⁸

¹ Cf. Aelian, II, 38. Other explanations of the ibis-cult made by non-Egyptians are collected by Hopfner, *Tierkult*, p. 118f. Cf. also the hieroglyphic determinative  used with the verb *h3m*, "to catch (fish etc.)". See Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar*, p. 473 (sign-list G 51). The identity of the bird is uncertain—Gardiner suggests an egret.

² See above ch. 21.

³ Cf. the rather more obscure Pyr. 444ff.

⁴ Berlin 20132; Möller, *Die beiden Totenpapyrus Rhind*, p. 79.

⁵ See Gardiner, *Anc. Eg. On.*, II, p. 269*.

⁶ *Urkunden*, II, 126, 8.

⁷ See above ch. 49.

⁸ For representations of the *pterophoras*, see Tran Tam Tinh, *Le culte d'Isis à Pompéi*, pl. V 2 and p. 92; pl. X 2 and p. 143, where the sacred scribes are shown with two feathers on the sides of their heads.

87.9 The "eagle" was probably the vulture, the bird associated with Mut, the mother of all, who was identified by the Greeks with Hera. Mut was famous in Thebes, and it is possible that Diodorus mistakenly associated her bird, the vulture, not with her but with the chief god of Thebes Amon-rē'. Amon-rē' was naturally equated with Zeus, and in Greece the eagle was regarded as the bird of Zeus. But neither the vulture nor the eagle were ever held by the Egyptians to be sacred to Amon-rē'.

CHAPTER 88

88.1 The goat-cults mentioned by the Classical authors were in fact ram-cults.¹ The Egyptians themselves seem to have confused the two animals, and biologically the difference is small. In addition the Greek Pan, although half man, half goat, was believed to have assumed the form of a white ewe or ram in his pursuit of Selene.²

88.2 For phallic worship in Egypt, see above ch. 22.6.

88.4 The true reason for the sanctity of the Apis and Mnevis bulls is not known, but they probably represented the fertile principle. Bulls, or oxen, were used for the heavier agricultural tasks, but the Apis and Mnevis bulls themselves appear to have led a life of luxury in their respective enclosures.

Bulls in general were not considered sacred, as were cows, and their use in sacrifice is attested in the Pyramid Texts. Red cattle in particular seem to have been popular for sacrificial purposes, for the reason which Diodorus gives; and the Festival Calendar at Edfu records the sacrifice of red oxen, probably by fire.³ Certainly in the Horus-myth at Edfu, Seth appears as a red hippopotamus.⁴

For the sacrifice of red men, see above ch. 67.11.

88.5 The true etymology of the name Busiris is given here. Busiris was the Egyptian town *'ndt*, which had the more common

¹ See above ch. 84.

² Ovid, *Met.*, I, 694-712.

³ Wainwright, *The Sky-Religion in Egypt*, p. 54; Griffiths, *Plutarch*, p. 413f.; Kees, *Farbensymbolik*, 458-61.

⁴ Fairman, *JEA*, XXI, 1935, 27; Kees, *Götterglaube*, 14.

name of *Ddw*, later to become *Pr-Wsir-nb-Ddw*, "the House of Osiris, lord of Djedu." This in turn was shortened to *Pr-Wsir*, "House of Osiris", transcribed as Βούσιρις from the time of Herodotus onwards. The Coptic ⲁⲟⲩⲥⲓⲣⲓ led directly to the modern Abusîr.¹

88.6 The traditional wolf-god was Wepwawet, worshipped particularly at Siut, the Greek Lycopolis. According to Gaillard, "Les animaux consacrés à la divinité de l'ancienne Lycopolis", *ASAE*, XXVII, 1927, 33ff., the mummified animals discovered in this area are either pariah dogs (*canis familiaris*) or crosses between dogs and small jackals (*canis lupaster*), indicating the existence of cross-breeding among the canines of Egypt.

Diodorus' account of Osiris' return from the dead in the form of a wolf to help Isis and Horus in their struggle against Seth is not supported elsewhere. Griffiths, *The Conflict of Horus and Seth*, p. 100, suggests that the wolf in this case is really the jackal god Wepwawet, or probably the god Khentiamenty of Abydos, with whom Osiris was identified.²

The story concerning the Ethiopians' invasion of Egypt and their defeat by bands of wolves is presumably an attempt to explain rationally the veneration of these animals. Lycopolis, however, is a considerable distance north of Elephantine.

CHAPTER 89

89.1 The crocodile was worshipped in several towns and nomes of Egypt. The most important crocodile-god was Sobek. Little is known of the origins of this god, but it can be understood that the presence of a creature such as a crocodile would cause fear and awe in those who lived nearby. It is possible that the crocodile was originally thought to resemble the morning sun, since both rose from the waves. But whatever the original reason for its worship, the crocodile with its evil disposition became associated with Seth,

¹ Gardiner, *Ancient Egyptian Onomastica*, II, p. 176*f. See also above ch. 67 and ch. 85.

² For the confusion of the dog and the wolf, see above ch. 87.

who took refuge in the body of a crocodile when fleeing from the avenging Horus. This was the event commemorated in the ritual crocodile hunt at Edfu.¹

89.3 The name Menas appears to be a variant of the name which appears elsewhere in the book as Moeris, Mendes or Marrus.² In the view of Vergote, "Le roi Moiris-Mares", *ZÄS*, LXXXVII, 1962, 66-76, these are all developments of the name Nema'rē the prenomen of Amenemhet III, the king most closely associated with the Fayûm.

It is possible that the story which Diodorus tells of Menas was an invention on the part of the priests of Crocodilopolis to magnify their own importance. But there is an interesting parallel in Egyptian literature, according to which Osiris, fleeing from a dog, was carried on the back of a crocodile, an event which one source states took place in the Fayûm. The pursuing dog in this account probably represents Seth.³

In the Late Period, mummies are often shown in representations on the back of a crocodile swimming in the water.⁴ This represents the watery death of Osiris, and his rescue, which according to one legend was effected by Horus in the form of a crocodile⁵: "Horus came and brought the limbs of Osiris on the water, on this day in his form of a crocodile."

89.4 For abstention from various foods, see Herodotus, II, 37, Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, XVIII, 12.118f., and Plutarch, *DIO*, 5; *Quaest. Conv.*, 8.8.2 on the subject of beans; *DIO*, 8 on onions.

Beans and lentils are both mentioned in Egyptian texts in a variety of contexts, religious and medical.⁶ Onions were widely grown and eaten in pharaonic times, and by Roman times there was a cult of the onion in the Eastern Delta.⁷ While milk was an important

¹ See above ch. 35.6 and ch. 84.4.

² See above ch. 51.

³ See Posener, *JEA*, XXXIX, 1953, 107.

⁴ See Bonnet, *Reallexikon*, s.v. Beisetzung; Möller, *Die beiden Totenpapyrus Rhind*, p. 79.

⁵ Mariette, *Dendérah*, IV, 37, l. 90. Cf. Bonnet, *Bilderatlas*, 154.

⁶ *Wb.*, I, 56 (14 and 15) *iwryt* "bean"; P. Anastasi, 3 A.1; 4.8.11.

⁷ Erman and Ranke, *Ägypten und ägyptischen Leben im Altertum*, p. 522; Täckholm and Drar, *Flora of Egypt*, III, 98ff.

constituent of ritual offerings, dairy products seem to have played little, if any, part.¹

89.5 A similar explanation is given by Plutarch, *DIO*, 72. Hopfner, *Plutarch über Isis und Osiris*, II, 266, n. 3, compares the statement of the Jewish writer Artapanus, that Moses established the various animal cults to protect the rule of King Khenephres.

CHAPTER 90

90.1 For the origins of animal worship, see above ch. 86. The use of animal figures as tribal standards is well-attested in pre-dynastic and early dynastic Egypt.² Animals included the Seth-animal, the Horus falcon, the lion, scorpion and jackal.³ Egypt was then in a state of totemism, and the divine animal was identified with the ruler.

90.3 The kings of Egypt were indeed regarded as living gods, the incarnation of Horus, living son of the dead king who had become identified with Osiris.⁴

CHAPTER 91

91.1 For mourning, see above ch. 72. In a death scene from a tomb at Saqqâra, women are shown with bare breasts, dishevelled hair, and their hands in an attitude which suggests that they are pouring dust or mud on their heads.⁵

91.2 The exact process involved in mummification has long been a subject of discussion: the evidence, both Egyptian and Classical, is limited, and a comprehensive description cannot be deduced from it.⁶

¹ See above ch. 22.

² Cf. Plutarch, *DIO*, 72.

³ Quibell, *Hierakonpolis*, I, pl. 26c, 1 and 5; Petrie, *Ceremonial State Palettes*, pl. G.19.

⁴ See above ch. 11.1; see also Bonnet, *Reallexikon*, s.v. König; Frankfort, *Ancient Egyptian Religion*, p. 52, and *Kingship and the Gods*.

⁵ Von Bissing, *Denkmäler ägyptischen Sculptur*, pl. XVII b; Capart, *Rue de Tombeaux*, pl. LXXI.

⁶ Studies of mummies and mummification can be found particularly in Pettigrew, *History of Egyptian Mummies*; Elliot Smith and Dawson, *Egypt-*

Basically, the reason for embalming the body was to enable the various elements of the living person, dispersed at death, to reunite in the body, and enter a new life. The body was naturally considered the most corruptible part, and unless it was preserved from decay, the elements would have no physical frame to which to return. Embalming also reproduced in detail the method by which Osiris was originally resurrected from the dead. The process of embalming appears to be linked in origin with the cult of Osiris at Abydos,¹ and it was therefore essentially a religious process. At first it was the privilege only of the king, who in death was identified with Osiris, and of the wealthy; but as it became both simpler and cheaper, it was available to a larger number of people. The necessity for embalming the body may well have originated with the change from sand-burial, which preserved the body naturally, to tomb-burial, and the earliest instance may belong to the IIIrd Dyn.²

The only detailed accounts of embalming to be found in the Classical authors are those of Herodotus, II, 85, and Diodorus: Porphyry and Plutarch do little more than confirm the extraction of the intestines. The accounts of Herodotus and Diodorus are the more valuable in that they obviously do not stem from the same source, but appear rather to supplement each other. Both authors list three different classes of burial, varying in cost and technique. The three methods of embalming listed by Herodotus were 1) evisceration; 2) injecting cedar oil into the body and preventing its escape until the end of the treatment; 3) cleansing the intestines by an injection of an unspecified nature. According to Diodorus the cost of these methods was a talent of silver, twenty minae,³ and "very little" respectively.

It is, however, unlikely that the methods employed can be so decisively separated. Mummies have been found from what are *tian Mummies*; Engelbach and Derry, in *ASAE*, XLI, 1942, 233-265; Jonckheere, *Autour de l'autopsie d'une momie*. An excellent account of the process, based on the extant evidence is given in Lucas, *Ancient Egyptian Materials and Industries*⁴, p. 270-326.

¹ Griffiths, *Origins of Osiris*, p. 36.

² Griffiths, *op. cit.*, p. 30f.

³ It is interesting to note that the cost of twenty minae which Diodorus gives for the second class of burial is confirmed by the First Tale of Setna Khaemwese, III, 16, trans. Griffith, *Stories of the High Priests of Memphis*.

obviously the wealthiest burials, yet without a ventral incision, and therefore according to Herodotus not embalmed by the most expensive method. Far more probable is it that gradations of each method existed. Moreover the process involved tended to vary in different periods. For example, although initially the aim had been to reduce the body to its least perishable form (skin and bone) without regard for appearance, in the XXIst Dyn. it became a special feature of mummification to attempt to restore the mummy to its original appearance. This was achieved by packing various substances underneath the skin, placing pads in the cheeks, and onions or stones under the eyelids. And by the Ptolemaic and Roman periods, generally speaking, far more attention seems to have been paid to the outward appearance of the mummy than to its actual preservation. Thus while bandaging had become more elaborate, embalming itself was more ineffectual, and there are numerous examples from this period of defective and composite mummies which are not simply cases of rebandaging; although the fact that they seem to belong mainly to the poorer classes may account for the lack of care taken.

The initial step in the process of embalming must have been to ask the relatives of the deceased to choose the method to be employed. The body was then surrendered to the embalmers, who were classified under various names: the *wt*-embalmers, "chancellors of the gods", "embalmers of Anubis", "overseer of the mystery of the embalmer's art", and the lector-priests whose task was to recite religious texts at each stage of the process.

According to Herodotus, the first step was the removal of the brain from the cranium.¹ Diodorus does not mention this, but gives the first stage in what was presumably the most expensive process as the making of the ventral incision by the "scribe."² This, as he says, was made on the left of the body except in rare instances, although its exact position varies. Both Herodotus and Diodorus say that the incision was made with an "Ethiopian stone", which was probably obsidian or flint. The use of such an instrument was

¹ See Filce Leek, "The Problem of Brain Removal During Embalming by the Ancient Egyptians", *JEA*, LV, 1969, 112-117.

² See Revillout, *ZAS*, XVIII, 1880, 147.

obviously traditional and must date from a primitive period when flint was all that was available.¹

The ritual connected with the *paraschist*² is most interesting: it is mentioned by no one except Diodorus, and since Herodotus appears otherwise to have been well informed, it is strange that he makes no mention of it. The same ritual must surely have been followed during his time, since an action so obviously symbolic is scarcely likely to have been introduced suddenly into the proceedings. The most probable explanation of the ritual is that since embalming represented the divine mystery once performed over Osiris, the embalmer who made the initial incision was identified with Seth, who was originally responsible for mutilating the body of Osiris. He was thus ceremonially driven off with curses. Had any serious misgivings been felt, as Diodorus suggests, about applying violence to a body, presumably all embalming would have been done without the ventral incision.

The next step in the process was evisceration through the ventral incision, and all organs except the heart were removed. The kidneys, which Diodorus mentions specifically, are present in some mummies, absent in others. This is possibly because they are attached separately to the body, and could be accidentally missed in evisceration. The Egyptians are believed not to have known of the existence of the kidneys, at least in the earlier days of embalming. But presumably since Diodorus says specifically that they were left *in situ*, by his day (or that of his source) the Egyptians must have known of their existence and deliberately have left them. It is difficult to suggest how otherwise Diodorus could have known of their presence in mummies. The kidneys may perhaps have had some further significance, since in the inscriptions at Edfu there occur the lines, "I cut out the hearts of those who fight against the Behdet, I tear out the hearts of thy foes, I swallow the gore of those who are hostile to thy city, I taste the kidneys of thine enemies."³

¹ Cf. also the use of flint knives for circumcision, *Joshua*, V, 3.

² The term is found in Greek papyri of Ptolemaic times; see Otto, *Priester und Tempel*, I, p. 105, n. 6.

³ Blackman and Fairman, "The Myth of Horus at Edfu II", *JEA*, XXIX, 1943, 2-36, see p. 11. See also above ch. 14.1.

After extraction the viscera were treated, according to Diodorus, with palm wine and spices. There is no evidence in the mummies of palm wine, but as Lucas points out, the substance is too volatile for any trace to remain. The viscera were either preserved separately in four canopic jars, or, in the XXIst Dyn., were returned to the body in parcels.

At this juncture there appears a discrepancy in the accounts of Herodotus and Diodorus. The latter says briefly that the body was treated with cedar oil and certain other preparations for over thirty days, and then with myrrh, cinnamon and other spices. The composition of these various spices and preparations unspecified cannot be ascertained from the mummies, although it is possible to detect the presence of ointments. The use of myrrh and cinnamon¹ is attested by the documents concerning burials. The "cedar" oil was probably in fact a product of the juniper.²

Herodotus, however, at this point in his description records that the eviscerated body was filled with aromatic substances and was then packed in natron for seventy days. It is certain that natron was used to desiccate the body, since packs of natron have been found in the tombs; but the form in which it was used has long been misunderstood, mainly as a result of the various faulty translations of Herodotus, which implied the use of a natron "bath." Experiments on birds, performed by Lucas, have shown that dry natron is a far more efficient preserving agent than a solution; and his conclusions are confirmed by Sandison, "The Use of Natron in Mummification", *JNES*, XXII, 1963, 259ff., who applied similar experiments to human limbs. After treatment with natron the body was washed and bandaged.

The entire ritual of embalming appears to have taken an average of seventy days from first to last, although Herodotus ascribes this solely to the natron process. It is possible that the seventy days was intended to reproduce the period during which Sirius annually dis-

¹ *Cinnamomum zeylanicum*, probably the same as the cassia (*cinnamomum cassia*) of Herodotus' account.

² Its possible forms are discussed by Lucas, "'Cedar' Tree Products Employed in Mummification", *JEA*, XVII, 1931, 13-21. See also the Rhind Papyri: Smith and Dawson, *Egyptian Mummies*, p. 51; Möller, *Die beiden Totenpapyrus Rhind*.

appears from the sky.¹ But the duration of each step in the embalming process is unknown. According to the story of Setna Khaemwese, bandaging alone took 35 days. But this cannot be the "more than 30 days" of Diodorus, since he records that the body was treated during this time. On the other hand, the inscription of Anemher² records that the ceremonies began on the 4th day after death, embalming continued until the 55th day, wrapping until the 71st day, coffinng to the 74th day after death (but the 71st day of embalming, allowing for the initial lapse of 3 days after death). But a demotic embalmers' agreement³ gives as significant dates the 4th day, an indeterminable day (presumably between the 4th and 16th), the 16th day, the 35th day, and the day of coffinng. The significance of the 4th day is suggested by the inscription of Anemher. The ceremonies of the 16th and 35th days, and the day of coffinng are mentioned in the description of the burial of Neneferkaptah in the First Story of Setna Khaemwese: "Pharaoh caused there to be performed for him a festive entry into the embalming place on the 16th day, wrapping on the 35th day, coffinng on the 70th day; and he was put to rest in his sarcophagus in his tomb." The 16th day is also mentioned in the Apis Papyrus,⁴ while priests often promised to perform ceremonies for a dead colleague on the 35th day and the day of coffinng.⁵ The wrapping of the mummy apparently began on the 35th day, and the preceding period (of desiccation) must correspond to the "more than 30 days" of Diodorus.

Nevertheless, the total period of embalming appears to have varied widely on occasion. Thus according to Habachi, *ASAE*, XLVII, 1947, 278-281, Ankhefenamūn spent 72 days in the "House of Embalming",⁶ his daughter 70 days. But Psueredenptah lay in the Necropolis for 200 days before burial. At the other extreme, a Saitic stele of the priest Psammetik records that he "passed 32 days under

¹ See the First Tale of Setna Khaemwese, IV, 25, in Griffith, *Stories of the High Priests of Memphis*, p. 29f.

² Griffith, *loc. cit.*

³ Shore and Smith, *Acta Orientalia*, XXV, 1960, 277-294.

⁴ P. Wien, 27, XVIII, 21-22.

⁵ Shore and Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 291 and n. 28.

⁶ Cf. what Diodorus says concerning the period of mourning for a king; above ch. 72.2f.

the hand (the charge) of Anubis, chief of the Necropolis." This may well be compared with Diodorus' estimate.

In spite of these variations, it does appear that embalming was carried out in conformity with a definite canon. This, however, has not survived. Two papyri of the "Ritual of Embalming" are extant, both dating from the Roman Period.¹ They are both incomplete, but are essentially religious in character, concentrating on the detailed application of bandages and ointments, together with the prayers and incantations to be recited at each stage. Illustrations of the embalming process are rare except for those showing the initial ritual purification which took place before the embalmers started work.

91.6 When Diodorus talks of the unchanged appearance of the body after mummification, it is scarcely possible to believe that he is talking of the mummy itself. It is tempting to believe that what he has in mind are the realistic portraits of the dead, which, apparently as the result of Roman influence, replaced the stylized and idealized masks of an earlier age. Unfortunately it is unknown at what time Roman influence first became apparent in Egyptian art. The earliest examples of these realistic portraits date from the first half of the 1st century A.D. In fact, it is because of the apparently late adoption of the realistic style that the influence behind it is presumed to be Roman rather than Greek, as one might expect. But no such portraits have been found in cemeteries of a purely Ptolemaic character, and there is no evidence to support any dating before the Roman period.²

If these portraits cannot be ascribed to an earlier date, then what Diodorus must be referring to are the masks, introduced around the time of the Middle Kingdom, which were, at least in theory, intended to be life-like portraits of the dead. Made of cartonnage,³ the mask afforded some protection for the head of the mummy.⁴

¹ Sauneron, *Le Rituel de l'Embaumement*; see also Smith and Dawson, *Egyptian Mummies*, p. 45ff.

² See Shore, *Portrait Painting from Roman Egypt* (publ. Brit. Mus.). There is some similarity between the mummy portraits and the paintings of Pompeii, destroyed A.D. 79.

³ Layers of linen and papyrus, glued together and stiffened with gesso, a gypsum plaster or a mixture of whiting and glue.

⁴ Shore, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

CHAPTER 92

92.1f. Diodorus' description of an Egyptian funeral is an absorbing mixture of fact and fiction, an amalgamation of incidents drawn from actual funerary practice and from purely literary sources, and so compounded that it is difficult to separate the one from the other.

The idea that the dead have to cross water of some kind is widespread.¹ It is the more explicable in Egyptian ideas of the afterlife, because in the first place the Nile was the centre of Egyptian life; and in the second place, the burial ground was often situated on the opposite bank of the Nile to the town. Certainly there are references to ceremonies concerned with the crossing of water by the dead;² but the gathering of judges at the start of the funeral voyage has no obvious foundation in actual practice: the fact that he gives their number as 42 renders it beyond doubt that the judges to whom Diodorus refers are the 42 judges who play their part in the Book of the Dead. Furthermore, in ch. 72.4 Diodorus says that the body of the dead king in its coffin was placed before the entrance to the tomb, and only then was a tribunal established. This certainly seems more in keeping with the procedure of the Book of the Dead, where the Hall of Judgement is reached only at the end of an arduous and perilous journey.³

The date and place of origin of the Book of the Dead are uncertain, but it must be much older than the written texts, early versions of which appear even in the pyramids. Several recensions of the book are known, containing different selections of the various chapters. Its purpose was to provide the dead person with the correct magic formulae, incantations and knowledge with which to overcome the

¹ Cf. the death of King Arthur; the myth of the river Styx etc.; see in particular Grinsell, "The Ferryman and his Fee: a Study in Ethnology, Archaeology and Tradition", *Folk-Lore*, LXVIII, 1957, 257-269.

² See Bonnet, *Reallexikon*, s.v. Beisetzung. Even in the case of private people buried in the Old Kingdom, the funeral often involved a ritual voyage to Buto, Sais and Heliopolis (Griffiths, *Origins of Osiris*, p. 36).

³ However, Anthes, "Notes Concerning the Great Corporation of Heliopolis", *JNES*, XIII, 1954, 191f., suggests that after the death of the old king, there took place a formal questioning of the new king to establish his divine descent. If this is the case, it may be that an account of this ritual has become incorporated into Diodorus' somewhat garbled version of an Egyptian funeral.

many difficulties besetting his progress by land and sea through the underworld. The climax of the dead man's journey, once he had overcome the intervening obstacles, was the weighing of his heart in the balance against Truth. As a result of this judgement he would be either devoured by the monster Amemet or led into the presence of Osiris, his ultimate goal.

There is no definite statement of expected judgement in the earlier papyri: the idea is not fully expressed until the XVIIIth Dyn., although it must be older than this. The vignette of the judgement scene from the Papyrus of Ani in particular is remarkable for the fact that the judgement itself is here more fully represented and better described than in any other papyrus of the Theban recension.¹

Judgement took place in the "Hall of Two Truths" (or Double Ma'at, i.e. Isis and Nephthys), in the presence of the 42 judges or assessors,² who represented the 42 nomes of Egypt. When the dead man Ani enters the "Hall of Two Truths", he first recites an address to his heart and prays that no false witness may testify against him, no hostile evidence be produced, and no lies be told about him.³ Griffiths, *The Conflict of Horus and Seth*, p. 74ff. shows that there was more than one Egyptian idea of judgement. He quotes a selection of passages showing that the reference is not necessarily to a judicial examination of the life-record as it appears in ch. CXXV of the Book of the Dead, but occasionally to litigation where the dead man is opposed by his enemies. This is the idea reflected in Diodorus' account.

The dead man now describes the acts of piety performed by him during his life and follows this with a general denial of impious acts. This in turn is followed by the "Negative Confession", in which the dead man addresses each of the judges in turn, claiming that he has not committed a particular sin.⁴ The purpose of the "Negative Confession" was apparently to deceive the gods if possible, and

¹ Budge, *The Book of the Dead, Papyrus of Ani*, I, pl. III.

² Budge, *op. cit.*, I, pl. XXXI, XXXII.

³ Cf. Diodorus' account.

⁴ Few of the names of the judges are to be found in the ordinary god-lists, and they usually describe the function or place of origin of the 42. With the "Negative Confession", cf. Pyr., 462a-c; 386a-b; 892a-c; 2082c-2083a.

indeed, any affirmation that the soul was sinless seems to have been regarded as making it so. However, the "Negative Confession" appears to have had no real effect on the final judgement. The verdict was given independently as a result of the weighing of the dead man's heart against Truth. The weighing itself is shown being carried out by Anubis the mortuary god, while Thoth presides over the entire hearing, records the verdict of the weighing and announces it to the attendant gods. The monster Amemet stands by ready to devour the dead man should the verdict be unfavourable. If the dead man is proclaimed *mꜣ' hrw*, "true of voice", he is led by Horus before Osiris, thus reaching his goal.

There is no evidence that anyone was actually denied burial because of his sinful life. Perhaps what Diodorus has in mind is this judgement of the dead: if the dead man failed to be proclaimed "true of voice", he could not approach Osiris, and was thus deprived of eternal bliss.¹

In conclusion, it must be said that Diodorus' account of a funeral shows some similarity with the funeral of the Apis-bull, known to us from the Apis papyrus.² According to this the dead bull was carried on a decorated papyrus boat, while nine papyrus rolls were read, including one devoted to "the glorification of the drowned Osiris."³ Perhaps Diodorus' references to the shouts of the multitude (here and above ch. 72) are a misunderstanding⁴: certainly one would not expect revelry at a funeral (except perhaps an Irish wake), and the death of both the king and the Apis is invariably said to have caused mourning throughout the land. Thus the Apis papyrus talks of the need for a "cry of lamentation",⁵ and says "all the people must raise a great cry of lamentation" when the priests draw the bier.⁶

¹ See also above ch. 72.5.

² Spiegelberg, "Ein Bruchstück des Bestattungsrituals der Apisstiere", *ZAS*, LVI, 1920, 1-33.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 20f. Cf. above ch. 72.5.

⁴ Apparently continued by Plutarch, *DIO*, 35 who compares the shouts and movements of the priests during the Apis burial with those of Bacchic revellers.

⁵ Spiegelberg, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 20, l. 15.

92.2 What exactly Diodorus means by a "hemicycle" it is difficult to decide, especially as it was apparently a special construction erected beside the lake. The word normally refers to some kind of semi-circular object such as a seat or statue-base; but among its meanings is a "public meeting-place." Presumably the word must have some such connotation here, in which case it may refer to the Hall of Two Truths in which the judgement of the dead took place,¹

92.2 Herodotus, II, 96 also mentions a type of boat called βᾶρις.² The word almost certainly comes from the Egyptian *br*, "boat", a New Kingdom word invariably written in group-writing *b(3)(y)r*.³

92.6 According to Petrie, *Hawara, Biahmu and Arsinoë*, p. 15, there is evidence from the Roman period for the practice of storing coffins in the home, and the condition of certain mummy coverings indicates that they were subjected to a long stay above ground. If this is the case, it seems reasonable to assume that the custom would be prevalent e.g. in the Fayûm area, where the ground would be damp and the bodies would survive longer above rather than below ground. But there is no evidence, at least at Hawâra, for its existence before the Roman period, although Herodotus, II, 86, also says that mummies were stored in the home. From this one must assume that the practice belongs to the later periods of Egyptian history, and presumably it must only have been a temporary measure.⁴

There is, furthermore, as Shore, *Portrait Painting from Roman Egypt*, p. 26f., points out, literary evidence for the practice of hanging portraits in the house. This raises the question of whether the

¹ One wonders whether this might not rather be a reference to the hemicycle of the Serapeum at Memphis, bearing in mind the fact that the Serapeum was the burial place of the sacred Apis bulls. The hemicycle consists of a semi-circle of eleven statues of Greek poets and philosophers, dating from the time of Ptolemy I (see Lauer and Picard, *Les statues ptolémaïques du Serapieion de Memphis*). If Diodorus is in fact referring to part of the Serapeum, then clearly it must have become confused in his mind with the Book of the Dead, since he mentions not eleven statues but 42 judges. Certainly a reference to the Serapeum would not be out of place here, particularly as much of what he says in this chapter fits our knowledge of the burial of the Apis bull.

² See also Iamblichus, *Myst.*, 6, 5; Aeschylus, *Supp.*, 873.

³ *Wb.*, I, 465, *br*.

⁴ See also Cicero, *Tusc.*, I, 180; Sextus Empiricus, *Pyrrh.*, III, 24, 226.

mummy portraits were in fact originally intended as such. It is possible that they were in the first instance hung in the house, and only after the death of the subject were they adapted for the mummy. (Thus some of the wooden panels seem originally to have been square until roughly trimmed to a point at the top, apparently to fit the shape of the mummy).

CHAPTER 93

93.1 The custom of pledging mummies as security for a loan is said by Herodotus, II, 136, to have been legally established by Asychis. Lucian also refers to the practice,¹ and there does seem to be evidence for it in Egypt. According to Wilcken, *Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit (Ältere Funde)*, I, the probable interpretation of the so-called Curse of Artemisia of the IVth century B.C. is that the wrong done by the man to his dead daughter consisted in pledging her mummy as security for a debt on which he had defaulted.² One wonders exactly what a creditor would do with a newly acquired mummy.

CHAPTER 94

94.1 Mneves is apparently only a variant of the name Menes, and Diodorus alone uses the form. The antiquity of much of the Egyptian legal system was widely recognized and it is probably for this reason that the traditional first king of Egypt was credited with the introduction of a written code. For Hermes (the Egyptian Thoth) as the author of knowledge, see above ch. 17.

94.2 The form Zathraustes, which is found nowhere else, is far closer to the old Iranian form Zarathustra than is the later form Zoroaster.³ The ἀγαθὸς δαίμων by whom Zoroaster was instructed is Ormuzd, the god of light.⁴ Zoroaster was known to the Greeks as

¹ περὶ πένθους c. 21 (ed. Jacobitz).

² Cf. also Bell, *Cults and Creeds in Graeco-Roman Egypt*, p. 4. There is also evidence that burial-plots could be mortgaged; see Taubenschlag, *The Law of Greco-Roman Egypt in the Light of the Papyri*, p. 30 and 276.

³ Bidez and Cumont, *Les Mages Hellenisés*, p. 6, n. 5 and B 19, n. 3.

⁴ Bidez and Cumont, *op. cit.*, p. 59, n. 3.

early as the Vth century B.C., and references to him are common in the Hellenistic era.

94.2 In the fuller account of Zalmoxis or Gebeleizis to be found in Herodotus, IV, 93ff., Zalmoxis appears as a daemon or spirit of the country, to whom the Thracians owe their immortality. Strabo, VII, 3.5 records the Euhemeristic version of the story, according to which Zalmoxis (here called Zamolxis) was mortal and a former slave of Pythagoras; a story already rejected by Herodotus on chronological grounds. Whoever invented this version must presumably have done so after noticing the similarity between the Pythagorean doctrine of the soul and the Thracian belief. Certainly Diodorus' Zalmoxis appears to be mortal, and one must assume that Diodorus is following a Euhemeristic source.

It was the Thracian concept of immortality which the Greeks found strange, and which they could not accept even while accepting the Thracian cult of Dionysus. Although the latter contained the essential features of Thracian religion to be found in the cult of Zalmoxis (i.e. human sacrifice and a sacramental feast), it must have been a milder, much less barbarous form of the cult which was accepted officially in Greece.¹

94.2 For the form of the name 'Ιαώ see Ganschinietz, in *RE*, IX, I, 698-702.

94.3 Sasychis is the Asychis of Herodotus, II, 136. Hall, *Ancient History of the Near East*, p. 127, and Lauth, in *ZÄS*, VI, 1868, 4-44, suggest that this king is to be identified with Shepseskaf of the IVth Dyn., the successor of Menkaurē'. Pietschmann, in *RE*, II, p. 1879 considers this improbable, and suggests that the name is probably a variation of Sheshonq, a theory first proposed by Stern.² Unfortunately neither of these suggestions can be proved, nor are they entirely satisfactory from the linguistic point of view.

94.4 Meyer, "König Sesonchosis als Begründer der Kriegerkaste bei Diodor", *ZÄS*, LI, 1913, 136 suggests that the Sesoösis of this

¹ Guthrie, *The Greeks and their Gods*, p. 174ff.

² "Die Randbemerkungen zu dem manethonischen Königscanon", *ZÄS*, XXIII, 1885, 93, n. 1.

chapter is not the legendary hero, but the first king of the XXIInd Dyn., Sheshonq I. If this is so, it is unlikely, though not impossible, that Sasychis is also to be identified with Sheshonq. But Diodorus' words, λέγουσι Σεσόωσιν . . . μὴ μόνον τὰς πολεμικὰς πράξεις ἐπιφανεστάτας κατεργάσασθαι τῶν κατ' Αἴγυπτον, κτλ, are far more likely to be applied to Sesostris than to Sheshonq.

94.5 For Bocchoris, see above ch. 79.1.

CHAPTER 95

95.1 That the reign of Amasis was a time of peace is confirmed by the architectural activity and the many records of commercial negotiations of that period.¹ Spiegelberg, *Die sogenannte demotische Chronik*, p. 32f., and pl. VIII, reproduces the edict of Cambyses unfavourable to the economic affairs of Egyptian temples, which reduced the substantial revenues which must have existed under Amasis. And the same document² contains a report of the restoration of valuable institutions which had existed in the time of Amasis.

The story of the Elean embassy is also given by Herodotus, II, 160, but the king concerned is here said to be Psammis (Psammetichus II). As far as Polycrates of Samos is concerned, there seems to have been a defensive alliance of some sort between him and Amasis against Persia,³ but there does not appear to be any evidence for the story which Diodorus gives concerning the dissolution of this alliance. Polycrates seems to have submitted to Persia after Cambyses, upon his succession to the throne, had made clear his intention of invading Egypt. Egypt was thus left to face Persia alone, and it is not difficult to understand that Amasis' feelings towards Polycrates could hardly have remained cordial.

95.4 Darius does indeed seem to have been generally respected by the Egyptians. In his time, Egyptian law enjoyed a reputation

¹ Cf. above ch. 68.1. See also Jelinkova-Reymond, "Quelques recherches sur les reformes d'Amasis", *ASAE*, LIV, 1957, 251-287.

² Spiegelberg, *op. cit.*, p. 30f.; pl. VII.

³ Herodotus, III, 39-43; Gyles, *Pharaonic Policies and Administration*, p. 36.

for justice, and Darius directed the writing of the Egyptian code in demotic, together with a translation into Aramaic for use in his country.¹

For the lawlessness of Cambyses, see Herodotus, III, 16, 27-8. For these actions of his, however, there is no contemporary Egyptian evidence, and they may well be the inventions of the anti-Persian faction. On the contrary, the main inscriptions of the time suggest that Cambyses governed according to Egyptian custom, and honoured the Egyptian gods.² And although these assertions may be as biased in favour of Cambyses as the statements of Herodotus are against him, the truth probably lies somewhere between the two.

CHAPTER 96

96.1f. For Orpheus see above ch. 23.2; for Melampus see below ch. 97.4. Musaeus was the mythical son or disciple of Orpheus, and the eponymous author of oracle-literature. His name was eventually attached to any mystical verses, and he seems in fact to have been little more than a double of Orpheus.³

96.3 Strabo, XVII, 1.29 says that the houses where Plato and Eudoxus had lodged were pointed out in Heliopolis.

Statues of the Greek sages were not uncommon in Egypt. The ideal example is the semi-circle of Greek poets and philosophers in the Serapeum at Memphis: the eleven statues, five poets and five philosophers arrayed on either side of the central figure of Homer, date from the time of Ptolemy I. The significance of the structure is examined by Lauer and Picard, *Les statues ptolémaïques du Sérapéion de Memphis*, who conclude that it was essentially associated with the cult of Dionysus, and may be compared with the Greek *stibadeia* sacred to this god.⁴ The statues are shown to be the natural companions of a god who was by this time seen as the patron of

¹ Spiegelberg, *op. cit.*, p. 30ff.; Mattha, "A Preliminary Report on the Legal Code of Hermopolis West", *Bull. de l'Inst. d'Égypte*, XXIII, 1941, 297-312; Reich, *Mizraim*, I, p. 178; Gyles, *op. cit.*, p. 40; Seidl, *Ägyptische Rechtsgeschichte der Saiten- und Perserzeit* (1968), p. 1f. See also above p. 31.

² Gyles, *op. cit.*, p. 39f.

³ See Guthrie, *Orpheus*, ch. V, n. 2, p. 191.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 39ff.

artistic and philosophic inspiration. At the same time, although the hemicycle is to be seen primarily as a Dionysiac monument, it also symbolizes the Greek belief that much of their learning came from the Egyptians.¹

96.6 Hermes was generally identified with Thoth,² and both played their part in guiding the dead: Hermes, the Greek god of travellers, naturally extended his role to the traveller in the underworld as Hermes Psychopompos; Thoth is usually shown at the judgement of the dead, recording the decision.³ But in a funerary text of the Middle Kingdom he is shown as Psychopompos stretching out his hand to grasp the arm of the dead man.⁴

Anubis also, as usher to Osiris, was responsible for leading the dead person before the judges, and in this capacity he too became identified with Hermes in the form Hermanubis. But Hermes here must be identified with Thoth, since he is said to hand the dead man over to one who wears the mask of Cerberus: this can only be Anubis, the jackal-headed god.

96.6 The quotations are from Homer, *Od.*, XXIV, 1-2, 11-14.

96.7 In fact Homer's only name for the river Nile is Αἴγυπτος.

96.7 The kingdom of Osiris was known as the "Field of Offerings" containing the "Field of Reeds", in which Osiris actually dwelt. Representations of Egyptian after-life indicate that it was believed to be spent in a terrain similar to the Delta: the dead man is frequently shown hunting in the marshes and fishing in the river.

96.7 The location of the lake which Diodorus here calls Acheousia is uncertain, though there is evidence that the river ran close to the walls of Memphis.⁵ According to Montet, *Géographie de l'Égypte ancienne*, I, p. 30, "Le témoignage d'Hérodote confirme celui de Piankhi. L'historien grec a vu une dique dont l'établissement

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 46. This belief was particularly connected with the Academy (cf. Plato, *Timaëus*).

² See above ch. 16. Cf. Boylan, *Thoth the Hermes of Egypt*.

³ See above ch. 92.

⁴ Lacau, *Sarcophages antérieurs au Nouvel Empire*, I, p. 161.

⁵ See the stele of Piankhi, Breasted, *AR*, IV, 861; see also above ch. 50.

remontait à Ménès, qui forçait le Nil à couler à l'est. Un lac alimenté par le fleuve couvrait l'ouest et le nord de la ville. Strabo (XVII, 32) a vu également les lacs et un grand bois."

There was also, however, a lake in the Necropolis called λίμνη Φγήτ in Ptolemaic times.¹

96.9 Plutarch, *DIO*, 29 also says there were gates named Lethe and Cocytus at Memphis, and according to Griffiths, *The Origins of Osiris*, p. 61, "Secret Gates" was a name of the Memphite necropolis. Alternatively, this may represent a reference to the Book of Gates, which covered the nocturnal journey of the sun's barque through the twelve regions of the underworld. Each region was separated from the next by massive gates, guarded by monsters, whose names the dead man must know in order to pass. Two fire-spitting snakes and two gods were thought to guard the approach.

96.8 For βάρης see above ch. 92. There is no evidence that the Egyptian for "boatman" was Χάρων.

CHAPTER 97

97.2 The site of the city of Acanthi remains uncertain. The Egyptian city of this name is mentioned only four times by the Classical authors: according to Diodorus, it lay to the west of the Nile, 120 stades from Memphis. According to Strabo, XVII, 1.35, μετὰ δὲ Μέμφιν Ἀκανθος πόλις ὁμοίως ἐν τῇ Λιβύῃ καὶ τὸ τοῦ Ὀσίριδος ἱερὸν καὶ τὸ τῆς ἀκάνθης ἄλσος τῆς θηβαϊκῆς, ἐξ ἧς τὸ κόμμι. Stephen of Byzantium says much the same: ἔστι καὶ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ Ἀκανθος, Μέμφιδος ἀπέχουσα σταδίων τριακοσίων εἴκοσι καὶ δύο, [ἐν ᾗ] τῆς ἀκάνθης τῆς θηβαϊκῆς ἄλσος εὐμέγεθες, ἐξ ἧς καὶ τὸ κόμμι συνάγεται. Ptolemy, *Geog.*, IV, 5.55 places the city in the same latitude as Aphroditopolis (Atfih). The city in any case seems to have received its name from the trees which grew there.²

¹ Gauthier, *Dictionnaire Géographique*, IV, 188; Amélineau, *Géographie de l'Égypte à l'époque Copte*, p. 340.

² *RE*, I, 1159-62, esp. 1161 fin. There appear to have been two sorts of acanthus, white or black, according to Hellanicus ap. Athenodorus, XV, 679f. The black was probably *Mimosa nilotica*, from which gum arabic was obtained.

The exact site of this particular city of Acanthus is problematical. If Ptolemy's latitude reference is correct, then it is to be placed in the XXIst U.E. nome, and presumably south of Lisht. Griffith, *JEA*, III, 1916, p. 142, would identify the city with *šn'-hn* which he translates as "warding off the intruders", an apt name for a city of prickly acacia,¹ and he locates it between Meidûm and Lisht. Daressy, *Rec. Trav.*, XXVII, 1905, p. 189, n. 3 and *BIFAO*, XII, 1916, p. 23f., suggests that the city is to be identified with *ity-t3wy*, which he believes to be Dahshûr or Lisht. *ity-t3wy*, whose name means "Controller of the Two Lands", was a fortified town founded by Amenemhet I of the XIIth Dyn., between Memphis and Meidûm, to record the reunion of the two halves of Egypt under his domination²; according to Gardiner, *Sinuhe*, p. 93 and 167, it was founded at Lisht, since the pyramids of Amenemhet I and Senwosret I have been found there. Yoyotte, "Études géographiques I, la cité des Acacias", *Rev. d'Ég.*, XIII, 1961, 71-105, suggests that Lisht is in fact derived from *ity-t3wy* (*ιστο, *El isht), but at the same time disagrees with Daressy's identification of *ity-t3wy* and Acanthus. He suggests that Acanthus is indeed *šn'-hn* (or *smnw-Hr*) of the XXIst U.E. nome, also called in the Late Period *šnw-'nhw* "Les-Arbres-Vivants", in reference to the cult of Osiris, because of its sacred grove of acacias.³

According to Yoyotte, the XXIst nome preserved the left leg of Osiris hidden in an abyss. He cites an inscription, "Le Roi x vient à toi, Osiris seigneur de Smenou-Hor. Il verse la libation à l'orifice de l'Abîme chaque jour." Thus the πῆδος of Diodorus account "était manifestement la représentation matérielle du gouffre insondable, qui dans les tréfonds d'Acanthôn cachait 'la jambe gauche' ... d'Osiris." This relic, Yoyotte believes, was held to be responsible for the fertility of Lower Egypt, and there is thus a close connection between Acanthus and the Abaton.⁴ There is an inscription at Bigeh, "Isis remonte vers l'Abaton, elle pénètre dans le gouffre de l'abîme (*dwt*) et y trouve les deux jambes d'Osiris en action" (*Abaton*, 79).

¹ Gardiner, *Anc. Eg. On.*, II, p. 118* doubts the validity of this translation.

² Gauthier, *Dic. Géog.*, I, 124.

³ Moreover, the traditional name for cultivable land in the XXIst nome was *šht šnq* "La campagne d'Acacia."

⁴ See above ch. 22.3.

Thus as the Abaton was the source of the Nile flood for Thebes and Upper Egypt, so was Acanthus for Memphis and Lower Egypt.¹

97.2 The *πίθον τετρημένον* is explained in Suidas, *Lexicon*, II, p. 239: "In Egypt earthen water-jars full of tiny holes are often made, to the intent that muddy water may be made clear by passing through the holes." Sloley, "The Origin of the 365-day Egyptian Calendar", *ASAE*, XLVIII, 1948, 261-265, suggests that the perforated jar at Acanthus may have been a clepsydra. Whatever its purpose, the ritual obviously reminded the Greeks of the punishment undergone by the fifty daughters of Danaus, condemned after death to the interminable task of filling with water a vessel full of holes.²

97.3 Yoyotte, in *Rev d'Ég.*, XIII, 1961, 71-105, compares this reference to the myth of Ocnus with the story told by Herodotus, II, 28, of Psammetichus' fruitless attempt to estimate the depth of the springs of the Nile with a rope. He suggests that Diodorus' account may represent a symbolic drama intended to show that "l'Abîme" was impenetrable and the way to the god unknowable.

Whatever the truth behind the Egyptian festival, Diodorus saw in it a reference to the Greek Ocnus, the personification of Indolence. He is generally depicted³ as an old man plaiting a rope, while an ass

¹ For the northern source of the Nile, see also Gardiner, *Anc. Eg. On.*, II, p. 131*; 134*. In tentative support of Yoyotte's theory, one may perhaps cite Plutarch, *DIO*, 20 (359b). Unfortunately the reading *πύλας* or *πύλαις* is suspect, and the emendation *φύλαις* is generally accepted (see Griffiths, *Plutarch*, p. 365f.). Leaving aside the question of the slight awkwardness of the unanswered *μὲν* in Plutarch's text, it must be admitted that Yoyotte's theory could be compatible with Junker's defence of the ms. reading (*Abaton*, 69-70) and his suggestion that the ritual at Philae was simply a replica of that in other Osirian centres, including Memphis. But if one does accept the original ms. reading of Plutarch, there is the further problem of the exact identity and location of the "island near the gates." Presumably the gates will be those mentioned by Diodorus, I, 96.9 and Plutarch, *DIO*, 29, but the island remains a problem. Could it be Nilopolis, closely associated with the Apis bull? (see above ch. 85.2).

² Frazer, *Pausanias' Description of Greece*, V, p. 388f., suggests that this was the punishment not only of the Danaids, but also of all unmarried, and therefore uninitiated, women. See Plato, *Republic*, 363ff.; Guthrie, *Orpheus*, p. 161ff.

³ See Frazer, *op. cit.*, V, p. 376-379.

behind him devours it as he plaits. Ocnus is not always shown in the underworld, but when he is, it is frequently in the company of the Danaids.

Although it undoubtedly *is* the myth of Ocnus with which Diodorus equates this ritual, one wonders whether there is any need to emend the manuscript reading ὄνον to Ὀκνον. Diodorus may well have felt that his τὴν δὲ περὶ τὸν ὄνον μυθοποιῶν with his subsequent explanation, would be fully comprehensible to his reader. This may be the more relevant in that the ass was in Egypt a Sethian animal¹ (though the Seth-animal is almost certainly not an ass), and while all the participants in the ritual appear to have been men, Diodorus may have been aware that one at least of them represented an ass. Perhaps one might see in the ritual a symbolic capture of Seth in particular or the enemies of Horus in general.

97.4 The tradition that Melampus brought the rites of Dionysus to Greece from Egypt is to be found first in Herodotus, II, 49,² and that is the tradition recorded in this chapter. However, in ch. 23 Diodorus has already attributed to Orpheus the part now played by Melampus, and there does seem to be some confusion.

The association of Melampus with Egypt seems to be confined to Herodotus, Diodorus and Clement, but since the Egyptians were known as the Melampodes, or Blackfeet,³ it is remotely possible that the similarity in names led to the association. However, while the association of Melampus with Egypt is made tenuously as early as Herodotus, it is not until Apollodorus that we have an unequivocal reference to Egypt as Μελαμπόδων χώρα. On chronological grounds then the theory seems improbable.

Like Orpheus, Melampus was said to be dear to Apollo;⁴ but there is a definite association with Dionysus in that in one story Melampus was summoned to Argos to cure the daughters of Proteus of a madness apparently inflicted by Dionysus. However, the earlier

¹ Bonnet, *Reallexikon*, p. 172; Tamesseum Dramatic Papyrus, (Sethe, *Dramatische Texte*) 33; cf. Plutarch, *DIO*, 30, 31, 50.

² Cf. Clement ap. Eusebius, *Praep. evang.*, II, 363b: Μελάμποδα δὲ τὸν Ἀμυθαόνος ἄλλοι φασὶν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου μετακομπίσαι τῇ Ἑλλάδι τὰς Δηοῦς ἐφορτάς, πένθος ὑμνούμενον.

³ Apollodorus, II, 1.4; Eustathius, 37.23; Schol. Plat., *Tim.*, 25B.

⁴ Diodorus, VI, 7.7; Schol. Apoll. Rhod., I, 118.

versions of the story mention neither Melampus nor Dionysus, and the madness is inflicted by Argive Hera.¹

97.6 Wiedemann, *Herodots zweites Buch*, p. 402, suggests that Daedalus was credited with the construction of the propylon of the temple of Ptah, because of some confusion between his name and one of the names for Ptah, Tatenen.

For the similar proportions of Egyptian statues and the kouroi, see below ch. 98.

97.7 Sigerist, *A History of Medicine*, II, p. 23, suggests that τὸ νηπενθὲς φάρμακον may be either opium or hashish. Opium, known as *opium thebaicum* since it came particularly from Thebes, was produced in Egypt in Roman times; but there is no evidence for the cultivation of *papaver somniferum* before the Greek period, although there is evidence for *papaver rhoeas*. However, it is possible that opium was produced earlier in limited quantities.

The reference here is to Homer, *Od.*, IV, 220ff., but Homer gives no clue to the drug's identity, other than that it was Egyptian, probably vegetable (l. 229), and not a liquid (βάλε not χεῖε l. 220). Allowing for poetic exaggeration, the drug must still have been potent.

97.8 There is a clear parallel between the Greek and Egyptian evidence here, since Homer constantly uses the epithet "golden" to describe Aphrodite, while the Egyptian goddess Hathor, identified with Aphrodite, was regularly called *nwb.t*, "the golden one." This epithet, however, though later taken to mean "golden", in origin probably signified "she of *Nbt*."²

Sethe, *Urgeschichte*, p. 54f., says that Hathor was originally considered to be the mother of Horus in the Horus-nome of Damanhur-Momemphis (to the west of the Delta, near Lake Mareotis).

97.9 Presumably this chapter refers to a festival involving the bark of Amūn of Thebes, since this is the god commonly identified

¹ *RE*, XV, 1, 392-399, esp. 398; see also Rohde, *Psyche*, p. 309, n. 27; Jebb, *Bacchylides*, p. 211f. For an excellent discussion of Melampus, see Parke, *The Oracles of Zeus*, p. 165-171.

² Jéquier, *Considérations sur les religions égyptiennes*; Harris, *Lexicographical Studies in Ancient Egyptian Minerals*, p. 224; Stadelmann, *Syrisch-palästinensische Gottheiten in Ägypten*, p. 3f.; *Wb.*, II, 239(B).

with Zeus. River-barks belonging to various gods are not uncommon¹: during festivals they were carried in procession on the shoulders of the priests. At the time of Thutmose III, there were each year 54 of these festivals during which the bark of Amūn, containing the statue and shrine of Amūn, would be paraded outside the temple, taking part in various ceremonies. But there was more than one bark of Amūn at Thebes, and it is uncertain to which of them Diodorus refers.

There were two festivals of particular importance at Thebes: in the annual festival known as the "Feast of the Valley",² the bark of Amūn was ferried from Karnak to the western bank to visit the temple of Mentuhotpe II. In another annual procession the bark of Amūn at Karnak travelled south to the temple at Luxor (Southern Opet) for the "Feast of Opet."³ This, however, did not involve crossing the Nile. In the Luxor temple itself, Alexander erected a shrine for the bark of Amūn of Opet, an ithyphallic manifestation of the god. At the beginning of the XXIst Dyn., every ten days Amūn of Opet visited Medinet Habu, where there was another ancient shrine of Amūn. During these visits, and during the "Feast of the Valley", Amūn of Opet and Amūn of Karnak visited the Lords of the West, or the earlier kings whose mortuary temples lay on the west bank of the river (Diodorus' Libya).

The confusion arises when Diodorus refers to the journey as annual. The two annual festivals were the "Feast of the Valley" and the "Feast of Opet", both involving Amūn of Karnak, but only the former involving a crossing from east to west bank of the Nile. On the other hand, Diodorus' references to the συνουσία of Zeus and Hera might suggest that the ithyphallic Amūn of Opet (Luxor) was involved, especially as the word Opet, while meaning "sanctuary", also means "harem."⁴

¹ They did not, however, come into direct contact with the river. For the description of one, see Breasted, *AR*, II, 888.

² Kees, *Ancient Egypt*, p. 269.

³ Kees, *op. cit.*, p. 260f.

⁴ See above ch. 15.1. A festival perhaps even closer to Diodorus' description might be the Sacred Marriage between Hathor and Horus at Edfu: see Alliot, *Le Culte d'Horus à Edfou au temps des Ptolémées*, II, 441-560, and cf. above ch. 70.

However, Eustathius, *ad Hom. Il.*, I, 128 also mentions an annual festival of twelve days during which the image of the Theban Amūn was paraded in Libya. According to Bates, *The Eastern Libyans*, p. 189f., the custom was not known before a late date, and was (like a whole series of similar stories) invented after the Egyptian occupation of the Siwa Oasis as a result of the immediate and firm identification of the indigenous Libyan god with the Theban Amūn.¹

CHAPTER 98

98.2 Pythagoras the mathematician and philosopher of the late VIth century B.C. was a leading teacher in the field of Orphism. It is not impossible that he visited both Egypt and Babylon, though it is unlikely that he was much influenced by the Egyptians, at least in the mathematical field. It is, however, almost certain that he gleaned some knowledge, however imperfect, of Babylonian mathematical and astronomical reckoning.²

98.3 Democritus of Abdera was the Vth century B.C. scientist and author of the atomic theory. A prolific writer, he wrote on a variety of subjects, including mathematics, physics, ethics, music, literature etc. He was reputed to have travelled widely,³ and may have stayed in Egypt.

98.3 Oenopides of Chios, mathematician and astronomer of the Vth century B.C., is credited with the discovery of the obliquity of the ecliptic.⁴ The sun appears to move in the opposite direction to the rest of the stars because its motion is in fact slower than theirs.

98.4 Eudoxus of Cnidos, the famous astronomer and mathematician, was a pupil of Plato. His stay in Egypt is so well attested that there seems no good reason to doubt it. However, Neugebauer⁵

¹ Diodorus maintains that the journey to Libya represented the mythical journey of the gods to Ethiopia. Bates, *op. cit.*, p. 190, n. 8, apparently believes ὡς ἐξ Αἰθιοπίας τοῦ θεοῦ παρόντος to be a mistake on the grounds that the geographical requirements show that Libya, not Ethiopia, is meant. But Diodorus' ὡς makes his statement perfectly valid.

² *RE*, XXIV, 171-209; Neugebauer, *The Exact Sciences in Antiquity*, p. 36.

³ Diog. Laert., IX, 35.

⁴ Diels, *Vorsokr.*, I, 393-395 (esp. 7).

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 151.

doubts how much he could have learned from the Egyptians. In the field of astronomy, the answer is almost certainly nothing.¹ He was the first to construct a mathematical system to explain the apparent movement of the heavenly bodies, but this can have owed nothing to Egyptian influence, nor, probably, to Babylonian influence. He is known to have written a description of the constellations with information of risings and settings. This appeared in two versions, *ἔνοπτρος* and *φαινόμενα*, and the latter was used by Aratus for his own work of the same name. It may perhaps be this work Diodorus has in mind when he refers to Eudoxus having studied astrology (rather than astronomy) with the Egyptians.

98.5 Theodorus was the son, not the brother of Telecles, and lived probably c. 550 B.C. Athenagoras, *Legatio*, 17 also says that the men were responsible for the statue of Pythian Apollo at Samos.²

98.6ff. This entire passage has long perplexed authorities on Greek and Egyptian art, and it is only recently that it has been explained.

The Egyptians at an early date developed a metrological system based on the mutual relationships of various parts of the body. The basic unit was the cubit, the distance from elbow to thumb-tip, and this was subdivided into 6 handbreadths of 4 fingers each. The thumb was considered to be $1\frac{1}{3}$ fingers: the clenched fist therefore consisted of 4 fingers and one thumb, or $5\frac{1}{3}$ fingers, or $1\frac{1}{3}$ handbreadths. The height of the standing male figure was considered to be 4 cubits, or one fathom.

When confronted with the difficulties of proportioning correctly the human figure in artistic representations, the Egyptians naturally made use of their metrical system based on the natural proportions of the human figure. To aid this, they employed first intersecting guide-lines and then a square grid. On the grid, the height of a man measured from foot to hairline³ was divided into 18 sections, each measuring one fist and providing the modulus for the grid. This

¹ See above ch. 81.4.

² See *RE*, Va, 2, p. 1917-1920.

³ The hairline was taken as the limit since the variety of headdresses made it impossible to allow for them in the canon.

system of division remained basically unchanged for over 2,000 years.

In the XXVIth Dyn., however, this system was altered and a new grid came into use. In the Saite period there occurred a metrical reform (the exact reason for which is unknown) which resulted in the abandoning of the ordinary cubit as the basic unit of measurement in favour of the royal cubit. The latter in the earlier system had merely been an extension of the ordinary cubit by one handbreadth, and represented the difference between elbow-thumb (6 handbreadths) and elbow-medius (7 handbreadths).¹ The Saite canon now divided the height of the standing male, measured from the feet to a new point at the root of the nose, into 21 squares.

The stages of reasoning by which the grid underwent this change have still not been fully explained. Iversen, *Canon and Proportions in Egyptian Art*, originally suggested that the ordinary cubit, elbow-thumb, now became the royal cubit; and the height of a man, being four times this distance, became 28 handbreadths instead of the earlier 24. Thus a theoretical element was introduced into the calculations, since a man's height obviously remained the same, i.e. 24 handbreadths. On this basis, since Iversen considered the modulus of the grid to have remained the fist, the new grid would now consist of 21 squares, the result of dividing 28 handbreadths by $1\frac{1}{3}$.

However, Hanke, "Beiträge zum Kanonproblem", *ZÄS*, LXXXIV, 1959, 113-119, demonstrates that it is more likely that the royal cubit remained the full armlength, elbow-medius, of 7 handbreadths, but was divided into 6 units on the new grid, just as the earlier ordinary cubit had been divided into 6 handbreadths.² This would entail the use of a modulus smaller than the fist, which on the old grid divided the royal cubit into $5\frac{1}{4}$ squares. This conclusion has been accepted by Iversen,³ and he has been forced to reconsider his former explanation of the origin of the 21 squares on the grid.

¹ The two cubits are found in parallel on the older cubit rods, the royal cubit apparently being used only for building purposes.

² However, although the earlier cubit was subdivided into 6 handbreadths, this was not apparent on the grid where the modulus was the fist. It is therefore not clear why there should be any need now to divide the new cubit into 6 units instead of the earlier 7, resulting in a modulus unrelated to the earlier fist or handbreadth.

³ "The Canonical Tradition" in the new *Legacy of Egypt*, p. 58-82 ed. Harris.

If Hanke's theory is correct, then the royal cubit remained the full armlength, but underwent a new division into 6 parts, each of which (conveniently termed "royal handbreadths" by Iversen) was slightly larger than the earlier handbreadth and slightly smaller than the fist.

The distance from elbow to thumb was no longer the cubital modulus of the system, although it is clear from the grids that it still bore the same relation to the full height of the man, i.e. $\frac{1}{4}$. Unfortunately a full explanation of the steps by which the Egyptians worked out the new grid system has not yet been made. Possibly once the full armlength had been divided into 6 new handbreadths, the distance elbow-thumb was established by subtracting from the full armlength one old handbreadth, or $\frac{3}{4}$ square, the distance between thumb-tip and medius on the old grid. But elbow-thumb could no longer now bear the same relation to elbow-mediis as before. However, once the distance elbow-thumb is established as $5\frac{1}{4}$ handbreadths or squares, the total height can be calculated as four times this amount, or 21 squares each consisting of one new handbreadth.

Iversen considers that the problem of the Saite canon will not be solved until the change of measuring point (now the root of the nose) has been explained. He rejects his own tentative suggestion that it was necessitated by representations of bald-headed men, on whom it was naturally difficult to assess the position of the hairline, feeling rather that it must be the result of the canonical readjustments themselves. But as yet no more plausible theory has been suggested.

Clearly, in Diodorus' account, the "21 parts" refers to the Saite canon. The " $\frac{1}{4}$ in addition", first regarded as an error, has now been explained by Iversen in the light of his acceptance of the royal cubit as the full armlength and represented by 6 squares on the grid. The $\frac{1}{4}$ must refer to the supra-canonical distance from the root of the nose to the crown of the head, which on the Saite grid occupied $1\frac{1}{2}$ squares. Iversen demonstrates that *τέταρτον* must refer to $\frac{1}{4}$ of a standard measure, which in this case is the royal cubit of 6 squares, $\frac{1}{4}$ of which is $1\frac{1}{2}$ squares.¹

¹ See Iversen, "Diodorus' Account of the Egyptian Canon", *JEA*, LIV, 1968, 215-218.

The possible Egyptian origin of the archaic Greek canon is discussed by Iversen, in *MDAIK*, XV, 1957, 134-147. In this article he demonstrates beyond doubt the metrological similarity between the Saite canon and the Greek kouroi. Moreover, he states that the Greeks differed from the Egyptians in that although their canon was based on the Saite one, yet for them the cubit was the full armlength rather than elbow-thumb; this was divided by them into 6 greater handbreadths. But in the light of Hanke's article, it becomes clear that this difference did not exist, and the Greek and Egyptian systems become identical.¹

Further research, however, has been done on the subject by Anthes, "Affinity and Difference between Egyptian and Greek Sculpture", *Proc. Amer. Philos. Soc.*, CVII, no. 1, 1963,² and he considers that there is little evidence for any considerable Egyptian influence on archaic Greek sculpture. If Ionian sculptors did visit Egypt, it is possible that they drew some inspiration from there, but the only source for this fact appears to be Diodorus. In Anthes' view the differences between Egyptian statuary and the kouroi are sufficiently important to render improbable the direct influence of the one on the other; while the similarities can be explained as individual attempts to enliven the earlier column-like statues. It is his theory then that although Greek sculptors were prepared to learn from Egypt, there is no direct link between archaic Greek statuary and its contemporary Egyptian counterpart (except for the manual technique).

Anthes suggests, therefore, that Diodorus' emphasis on the non-Greek procedure refers not to the making of the statue in two halves, but to the adoption of strict proportions. He proposes that the archaic Greeks used a series of guiding lines as an aid to drawing identical forms on different sides of the block of stone, a practice similar to that used by the early Egyptians, and based mainly upon visual appearance. In the Saite period, however, with the introduction of the new canon, the Egyptians began to sculpt using a grid system of mathematically fixed points (a similar process to that

¹ Cf. Herodotus, II, 168: ὁ δὲ Αἰγύπτιος πῆχυς τυγχάνει ἴσος ἐὼν τῷ Σαμίῳ.

² See also his article, "Werkverfahren ägyptischer Bildhauer", *MDAIK*, X, 1941, 79-121, esp. p. 118ff.

used later by the Romans), while their contemporary Greeks continued to follow the method used by the earlier Egyptians. Thus Telecles and Theodorus, after visiting Egypt, made the Samian Apollo according to contemporary Egyptian methods unheard of among their fellow Greeks.¹

Perhaps the two sculptors found it possible by employing the Saite canon to execute the statue in two halves.² Alternatively it is suggested by Casson, *The Techniques of Early Greek Sculpture*, p. 155, that Diodorus' version of the two halves is a slightly confused account of the process of sandcasting in bronze. But as Ridgway, "Greek Kouroi and Egyptian Methods", *AJA*, LXX, 1966, p. 68, points out, it is generally believed that the two Samian sculptors cast by the lost-wax process.³ It seems more likely that the division into two halves refers to the division of the figure by the frontal axis line, which in the case of sculpture in the round ran between the eyes, along the nose, through the navel to a point between the feet.⁴ In that case the making of the statue in two separate towns must be regarded as embroidery.

In the Vth century B.C. at least, the Greeks must have known "measured" statues, as Galen records the reform of the established canon by Polycleitus at this time.⁵ Diodorus appears to insist that

¹ But if, as Anthes suggests (and his exact words are: "This means that it (the Samian Apollo) had the conspicuous appearance of an Egyptian statue as contrasted to the numerous kouroi which have been excavated in Samos in our time"), the Samian Apollo differed from the kouroi, it is difficult to see why Diodorus should have remarked that it was similar to Egyptian statues in having the arms stretched stiffly by the sides and the legs set in a stride. The kouroi also have these characteristics, though differing from Egyptian statues in having a correct centre of balance and arms more naturally slightly bent. Rather it sounds as though he is attributing to the Ionian sculptors the fabrication of a kouros as opposed to the completely naturalistic statues of the Hellenistic age.

² Cf. Blümel, *Griechische Bildhauer an der Arbeit*, p. 16 and 56, who maintains that according to the archaic Greek method the statue emerges simultaneously on all sides, whereas the Romans, employing mathematical methods, found it possible to concentrate on one particular sector.

³ Although Diodorus describes the statue as ξύλινον, this may have no significance: the word originally means a statue carved in wood, but is also used to refer indiscriminately to any statue.

⁴ Iversen, *MDAIK*, XV, 1957, 139, n. 1.

⁵ *De Placitis Hippocratis et Platonis*, (ed. J. Müller, 1874), V, 459, 1; p. 426; cf. Vitruvius, *De Architectura*, III, 1.2.

the Greeks did not use such a canon, and this is confirmed by Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, XXXIV, 65; (Lysippus) *vulgoque dicebat ab illis factos quales essent homines, a se quales viderentur esse*. But the sources of both these authors belong to the early Hellenistic age, and the point of view recorded is that of the IIIrd or IIInd centuries B.C. Thus what Diodorus records is a lack of standard measurements for Greek sculpture in the Hellenistic age, but he obviously knew that early statues were made according to the Egyptian canon.¹

Lorenzen, *Technological Studies in Ancient Metrology*, attempts to show an entirely different basis for ancient metrological systems, working from the account given by Vitruvius. That is, he takes the navel as the centre of a circle whose circumference is touched by the outstretched hands and feet. Working from here he divides the diameter into 40 hypothetical modules, which experiments with the natural proportions of a model show to equal $\frac{1}{2}$ handbreadth. From experiment, the height of a man is established as $\frac{4}{5}$ diameter, or 16 handbreadths each of 5 fingers; or, since it is easier to deal in fractions of 4 than 5, 20 "derived hands" each of 4 fingers. In the same way Lorenzen establishes the proportion of the fist to the hand. But his method of calculation of the varying scales involved in his theory is so complicated as to be completely beyond the mathematical ability of the ancient Egyptians. Although he maintains that there is no need to employ mathematical doctrines in converting units from one scale to another, "since this can be done by ordinary projection from one line to another", nevertheless the supposition that an ordinary craftsman should have such a set of scales at his disposal presupposes just such a mathematical knowledge on the part of whoever erected the scales. Indeed, if, as Lorenzen tentatively concludes, the Greeks introduced this metrological system into Egypt, it is difficult to see how they could have effected such a complicated proportional system in the VIIth century B.C.

Lorenzen's interpretation of Diodorus' account is not in itself valid. In considering the Egyptian grid-system he maintains that the 19 squares of the first system, measured from the foot to the crown

¹ The use of the canon was soon abandoned, however, and Greek statues ceased to be bound by rigid proportions (Boardman, *Pre-Classical*, p. 98).

of the head, each represent one fist (of 5 inches) or by his calculations $21\frac{1}{4}$ "derived hands"; for the second system, the module is the "derived fist" of 4 inches, measured to the upper eyelid. From this he concludes that Diodorus' description of Egyptian sculpture refers to the first grid (19 fists or $21\frac{1}{4}$ "derived hands"), whereas that of Greek sculpture refers to the new Egyptian canon ($21\frac{1}{4}$ "derived fists" measured to the upper eyelid). But it is impossible thus to differentiate between Egyptian and Greek sculpture in Diodorus' account: the whole point of the passage is that in this instance they are the same. Moreover, if Diodorus were referring to the first canon, he would hardly be likely to talk of a division into $21\frac{1}{4}$ parts, when the artist obviously divided the full human figure into $18 +$ squares (or fists) on his grid, particularly when the $21\frac{1}{4}$ refers to the "derived" or artificial handbreadth, rather than to the natural one.

INDEX

- Abaton 95, 96, 278, 279
 Abd el-Latif 180
 Abu Simbel 134, 151
 Abydos 57, 58, 60 n.5, 94, 95, 116,
 151, 210, 241, 247, 259, 262
 Abyssinia 128, 141
 acacia 82, 278
 Acanthus (Acanthi) 82, 277-279
 Acherousia 276
 Acropolis 124
 Actisanes 180
 "Admonitions of an Egyptian Sage"
 220
 adultery 179, 229, 231
 advocates 225
 Aegyptus 119
 Aelian 134, 245, 255
 Aeschylus 48, 72, 119, 139, 235
 Agatharchides of Cnidos 2-5, 18,
 20-25, 31, 32, 34, 140, 141
 Agenor 101
 agriculture 95, 135, 136, 154, 194,
 212
 Agroitas 12, 31
 agrostis 141
 Ahhotpe 120
 Ahmose (XVIIIth Dyn.) 111, 120,
 180
 Aigypptos 81
 Akhenaten 220
 Alcaeus 104
 Alcman 67
 Alcmena 104
 Alexander the Great 4-6, 32, 33, 40,
 87, 88, 94, 116, 137, 138, 143, 159,
 165, 282
 Alexandria 13, 39, 63, 71 n.4, 79,
 84, 107, 159
 altars 151
 Amasis 27, 32, 134, 180, 191, 202
 206-208, 212, 228, 233, 274
 Amemet 269, 270
 Amenemheb 87
 Amenemhet I 165, 166, 168, 175-
 178
 Amenemhet II 178, 179
 Amenemhet III 160-163, 165, 181,
 196, 256, 260
 Amenemope, Instruction of 165,
 167, 221, 231
 Amenhotpe II 108
 Amenhotpe III 161
 Amon-Rê 59, 176, 193, 214, 215,
 258
 Amphitryon 104
 Amün 7, 54, 67, 68, 76, 106, 146,
 147, 154, 176, 177, 191, 192, 209,
 227, 251, 281-283
 Anatolia 104
 Anaxagoras 20, 45, 47, 139
 Anaximander 45
 Andjety 57, 58, 247
 Andromeda 106
 Andropolis 208
 Ani, Papyrus of, 269
 animals 110, 240-261
 Antaeus 80, 81, 92; (village) 92
 Anubis 57, 61, 83, 242, 251, 254,
 267, 270, 276
 Anysis 27
 Aphrodite 73, 183, 281
 Apion 142
 Apis 95, 160, 240-247, 258, 270
 Apollinopolis 69, 134
 Apollo 69, 73, 78, 81, 99-101, 235,
 280, 284
 Apollodorus 125, 160, 280
 Apollonius Rhodius, Scholia 10-12,
 20, 186
 Apries 203, 206-208
 Apuleius 151
 Arabia 77, 84, 165, 257
 Archemachus 10
 Archimedes' screw 3, 19, 131
 Archytas of Tarentum 131
 Argonauts 103
 Argos 104, 106, 118-120, 280, 281
 Aristides 139

- Aristophanes 139
 Aristotle 10, 20, 35, 44, 45, 53, 56,
 67, 122, 127, 140, 212, 217, 239, 256
 Armaeus 191
 army 126, 150, 168, 170, 203, 206,
 213, 215, 216, 230
 Arrian 87
 Artapanus 261
 Artemidorus 21-25, 31, 32, 34
 Artemis 255
 Asklepios 108
 Assurbanipal 200
 Assyria 86, 193-195, 200-202, 236,
 Astaboras 138
 Astapus 138
 astrology 236-238, 284
 astronomical ceilings 154, 237, 238
 astronomy 154-158, 236-238, 283,
 284
 Aswân 95, 128, 135, 140
 Asychis 272, 273
 Atar-en-Naby 246
 Atbara 128, 141
 Athenaeus 10, 82
 Athenagoras 284
 Athene 69, 70, 72, 121, 123, 124
 Athenians as Egyptian colonists 11,
 18, 118, 121-123
 Athens 39, 100, 118, 121-123, 158,
 191, 203, 218, 228, 233
 Athribis 196
 Athyrtis 26, 166
 Atlas 80
 Atomists 45, 46, 139, 283
 Atticus 11
 Atum 69
 Augustus 95
 Ay 191

 Ba'al 105, 118
 Babylon 53, 118, 174, 175, 201-
 203, 206, 207, 236, 283, 284;
 (Egyptian village) 174, 246
 Bactrians 150
 Badarians 55, 133
 bandits 227
 Barathra 126
 barley beer 19, 133
 Bastet 255
 bean, Egyptian 132
 Belus 118
 Bes 85, 97
 Biahmu 163
 Bicheris 190
 Bigeh 95, 278
 blackberry 133
 blasphemy 227
 blindness 26, 178, 179
 Bocchoris 34, 144, 180, 193, 194,
 231, 232
 Book of the Dead 78, 109, 255, 268-
 270
 Book of Felling Apophis 94
 bread 132
 bribery 221
 Britain 40, 41
 Bubastis 39, 130, 193, 215, 241,
 255, 256
 bull 55, 74, 160, 184, 185, 240-242,
 244, 245, 247, 258, 270
 Burnaburiash 102
 Busiris (king) 8, 14, 15, 80, 81, 103,
 145, 205; (place) 14, 15, 57 n.5,
 58, 62, 204, 243, 246, 247, 258,
 259
 Buto 255

 Cadmeia 102
 Cadmus 18, 101, 102, 119, 120
 Cadmus of Miletus 137
 Caesar 39-42, 44
 calendar 4, 72, 77, 154-158, 237,
 238; of Antiochus 139
 Callippus 158
 Callisthenes 11
 Cambyzes 147, 207, 212, 274, 275
 Canaan 202
 Canal 19, 23, 130, 131
 cannibalism 73, 74
 canopic jars 93, 265
 Canopus, Decree of 156
 Carpathus 182
 Castor 8, 42
 castor oil 19, 133
 cat 33, 39, 241, 255
 cattle 136
 Cecrops 122, 123, 125
 Cerberus 276

- Cetes 182, 184
 Ceylon 129, 130
 Chabryes, see Khafrē
 Charax 124, 125
 Charaxus 191
 chariot 119 n.1, 151, 177, 178
 Chemmis (Chemmo), see Panopoleis
 Chemmis, king, see Khufu
 Cheops, see Khufu
 China 229
 Christianity 64
 circumcision 121, 215
 Civil War 40
 class structure 212-214
 Clement of Alexandria 239, 257, 280
 Cleopatra 95, 143
 Colchis 11, 118, 170
 colonization, Egyptian 11, 18, 117, 118, 141, 170
 consanguineous marriage 111, 112
 contract, law of, 231, 232
 copper 76, 128, 129, 144
 Corinth 118
 corn 136
 "corn-Osiris" figures 58, 93
 cosmogony 16, 44-47, 50
 Council of Thirty 221, 222
 cow 55, 118, 185, 247, 253, 258; Hathor, 63, 66, 68, 91, 253; Isis, 63, 66, 253; Nut, 15, 247
 Crete 120, 125, 181, 183
 crocodile 94, 109, 134, 135, 226, 243, 252, 256, 259, 260
 Cronus 60, 71, 76, 116, 117
 crowns 150, 185
 crucifixion 229
 Ctesias 9, 25, 175
 cubit 171-173, 284-290
 cylinder seals 102 n.2
 Cyprus 206, 207
 Cyrene 206

 dactyl 104
 Daedalus 182, 281
 Damascus 77
 Damasias 122
 Danaus 101, 118-120, 125, 191, 279, 280

 Danel 103
 Daphnae 202
 Darius 31, 130, 143, 178, 217, 220, 230, 274, 275
 debt 232, 233
 Deir el-Bahari 148
 Delphi 100
 Delta 128, 131, 134, 135, 140, 144, 158, 165, 192-195, 200, 207, 222, 245, 255, 256, 276, 281
 Demeter 63, 68, 74, 109, 124-126
 democracy 218
 Democritus 45-47, 49 n.1, 50, 56, 139, 283
 Dendera 107, 210, 247
 desertion 230
 Deucalion 53
 Dicaearchus 186
 Diogenes of Babylon 70
 Diogenes Laertius 7
 Dionysus 5, 16, 17, 60 n.1, 61, 76, 77, 81, 82 n.4, 87-89, 97-101, 103, 109, 125, 243, 275, 280, 281
 Diospolis, see Thebes
 dismemberment 15, 61, 89, 95
 divorce 113, 114, 231
 Djoser 55 132, 217
 doctors 10, 239
 Dodecarchy 27, 28, 160, 195, 196, 199, 200
 dog 65, 241, 242, 254, 259, 260
 Dorian invasion 51
 Doricha 192
 dowry 113, 114
 drowning 60, 96, 109, 270

 eagle 258
 Eagle-mother 103
 ebony 129, 168
 Edfu 69, 74, 89, 116, 134, 135, 154, 210, 258, 260, 264
 education 30, 165, 204
 egg 217, 255; cosmic, 65, 117, 134
 Eileithvia 69
 elements 66, 67
 elephant 17, 87, 88, 138
 Elephantine 87, 138, 202, 203, 205, 207, 259
 Eleusis 74, 124-126

- embalming 30, 58 n.1, 61, 93, 97,
 239-241, 246, 254, 261-267; Ritual
 of, 267
 Empedocles 45
 epagomenal days 60, 72, 139, 155-
 158, 237
 Epaphus 118, 160
 Ephorus 21, 22, 36, 38, 51, 137,
 139, 140
 Epicureans 49
 Epicurus 45, 49, 50
 Eratosthenes 14, 31, 140, 142
 Erechtheus 123-125
 Erichthonius 120, 123
 Esarhaddon 195
 Etesian winds 138, 139
 Ethiopia 23 n.1, 77, 86, 106, 126,
 128, 129, 138, 143, 159, 168, 180,
 194, 200, 203, 226, 259, 263
 etymologies 31, 64, 65, 117, 132
 Eudoxus 13 n.1, 14, 28 n.2, 31, 275,
 283, 284
 Euhemerus 70, 71
 Eumolpidae 125, 126
 Eumolpus 124, 125, 126
 Euripides 47, 48, 101, 139, 182;
 Scholia, 119
 Europa 101
 Euryphron 238
 Eurystheus 104
 Eustathius 283

 falcon 55, 89-92, 185, 257, 261
 Fayûm 79, 85, 86, 105, 107, 161,
 175, 243, 246, 260, 271
 festivals 96, 210, 282, 283; of Isis,
 63, 64, 75, 136; Sed, 83, 185
 fetishism 54, 69
 fig 132
 fire 9, 72, 85, 86, 178, 179
 fish 135, 211
 flint 144, 263, 264
 flood 53, 54, 68
 food 211, 260
 Fostat 174
 funerals 212, 268-270
 furniture 144

 Gades 105

 Gallic (or Celtic) War 40-42
 Geb 46, 60, 76, 86 n.1, 90, 91, 105,
 117
 Gebel Silsila 128
 genitals 97
 geography of Egypt 18-25, 33, 34
 Giants 110, 111, 252
 Gilgamesh, Epic of, 53, 104
 Gîza 158, 187
 goat 243, 258
 gold 76, 84, 129, 138, 168, 176
 Gorgon 106
 graffiti 108, 189
 gravity 140
 Great Wife 112
 Greeks in Egypt 32, 34, 107, 113,
 138, 203, 206, 207, 216, 220, 221,
 235
 Gyges 200
 Gynaecopolis 201

 hair 17, 84, 211, 240
 Ha'py 159, 160, 246
 Haremhab 184, 191, 216
 Harmachis 191
 Harmais 191
 Haroëris, see Horus the Elder
 Harpocrates 89, 92, 240
 harpooning 135
 harvest 74, 75, 136
 Hathor 26 n.1, 63, 66, 68, 73 n.4,
 91, 92, 106, 166, 210, 251, 252, 255,
 256, 281
 Hatshepsut 107, 129, 143
 Hawâra 161, 162, 271
 hawk 185, 241, 257
 Hebat 104
 Hebrews 121
 Hecataeus of Abdera 2-9, 12, 14-19,
 25, 26, 28-34, 45, 47, 51, 70, 83,
 94, 152, 222
 Hecataeus of Miletus 19, 20, 137,
 140
 Helen 183
 Heliopolis 13 n.1, 55, 69, 71, 72,
 174, 176, 180, 208-210, 219, 220,
 242, 243, 246, 255, 275
 Helios 13 n.1, 69, 71
 Hellanicus 9, 10, 137

- Hephaestus (see also Ptah) 9, 48, 67, 71, 72, 85
Hera 76, 102, 104, 105, 154, 258, 281, 282
Heracleopolis 85, 86, 105
Heraclidae 40, 51
Herakles 18, 79-81, 85, 89, 92, 103-105, 171, 173
Herishef 79, 85, 105
Hermes (see also Thoth) 17, 69, 77-79, 86 n.1, 272, 276
Hermopolis 69, 241, 256
Herodorus Ponticus 171-173
Herodotus 1, 10, 19, 20, 24-30, 32, 38, 52, 69, 77, 98, 100, 104, 106, 127-130, 132-134, 136-140, 142, 144, 146, 158, 160-164, 168, 170-173, 177-179, 182-185, 187-189, 191, 195, 197-204, 206-208, 212, 213, 228, 233, 236, 240, 241, 247, 253, 255-257, 259, 260, 262-265, 271-275, 279, 280
Hesiod 47 n.4, 48, 67, 72, 77, 81, 86, 104
Hesperides 80
Hestia 10
Hierakonpolis 168, 256
Hiero II 131
hieroglyphs 32, 65, 171, 209, 236, 256
Hipparchus 158
Hippocrates 238
Hippodamus 212
Hippon of Samos 230
hippopotamus 134, 135, 252, 258
Hippys 10
history, universal 35-38
Hittites 150, 233
Homer 47 n.4, 64, 67, 77, 86, 104, 119, 127, 145, 208, 275, 276, 281; Scholia, 20, 21, 127 n.2
Hor-Aha 143, 242
Horapollo 239
horographs 110
horoscope 238
horse 119 n.1, 177, 178
Horus 13, 55, 58, 61, 63, 66, 68, 73, 81, 83, 84, 89-93, 106, 109, 110, 117, 134, 135, 174, 210, 241, 250, 252, 257, 259-261, 270, 280, 281; the Elder, 69, 72, 73, 81, 89-91; Horus-name, 56, 188; sons of, 93
House of Life 152-154, 214, 257
House of the Morning 209
houses 145
Hrihor 158, 215
human sacrifice 14, 160, 204, 205
Hyginus 103
Hyksos 118-120, 143, 178
Ibis 77, 241, 251, 256, 257
ichneumon 134, 255, 256
Imhotep 108, 217
Inaros 191
incubation 107, 108, 167
India 84, 87, 88, 116, 129, 130, 165, 175, 212
infanticide 229
inheritance 112, 215-217
inscriptions 108, 114, 115, 129, 166, 168, 170, 171, 189, 219-221
Installation of a Vizir 223
Io 101, 106, 118, 119
iron 129
irrigation 131, 135, 161, 162, 175, 212
Isiac hymns 16, 31, 74 n.1, 75, 114-116
Isis 7, 15, 39, 59-64, 66, 68, 70, 72, 74, 83, 86 n.1, 89, 90, 95, 97, 106, 109, 115, 116, 125, 152, 202, 247, 253, 254, 259, 269
ivory 168
ivy 17, 77, 82, 87
jackal 57, 58, 241, 251, 254, 255, 259, 261
Jahweh 105
Jerusalem 206
Jews 126
Josephus 142
judgement of the dead 151, 212, 222, 268-271, 276
judges 218-224
Jupiter 103
justice 211, 222, 223, 275
Justinian 64

- Kadesh, battle of, 150, 151
 Karel 170
 Karnak 121, 146, 177, 210, 215, 282
 Kerykes 126
 Khafre' 26, 27, 188-192
 Khartoum 128
 Khentiamenty 57, 58, 259
 Khnum-Rē' 243
 Khoiak 132
 Khons 66 n.2, 79, 80, 85, 105
 Khufu 26, 187-190, 242
 king 91, 94, 209-216, 218, 219, 225, 246, 261
 Knossos 181
 Korosko 168
 kouroi 287

 Labyrinth 28, 160, 181, 182, 196-200, 256
 Lake Baudouin, 126; Maeotis, 170; Mareotis, 84, 208, 281; Moeris, 160-163, 208, 243, 246; Serbonis, 126, 181; Timsah, 202; Victoria, 128
 language 77, 78
 Laomedon 103
 laurel 82
 law 30, 60, 112, 114, 211, 274
 law-courts 218-221, 224, 225, 232
 law-givers 31, 34, 60
 Lemnos 72
 Leontopolis 80, 243
 Leucippus 45
 Liber 103
 libraries 153
 Libya 77, 106, 166, 178, 193, 206, 282, 283
 lion 80, 104, 150, 151, 185, 243, 261
 literature 78
 logographers 137
 lotus 19, 131, 132, 141, 142
 Lucretius 49, 50
 Luxor 146, 282
 Lycopolis 254, 259
 Lycurgus 88
 Lydia 104, 201
 lyre 78

 Ma'at 209, 222, 223, 269-271
 Macedon 17, 83, 88; Wepwawet, 83;
 Macedonians 32, 38, 40, 138, 143
 magic 94, 109, 205, 268
 Manetho 12-14, 16, 17, 25, 28, 29, 31, 32, 71, 106, 116, 142, 143, 164, 171-173, 177, 188, 190-193, 199
 Marea 84, 202, 207, 208
 Marmor Parium 120, 124, 125
 Maron 17 n.2, 84
 Maroneia 17, 88
 marriage 112-114, 233-235; contracts, 112
 Marrus 27, 160, 181, 196, 260
 masks 184, 254, 255, 267
 mathematics 77, 78, 283, 284
 matriarchy 112
 Matris of Thebes 105
 Medes 203
 medicine 30, 133, 238-240
 Medinet Habu 146, 148, 282
 Melampus 98, 275, 280, 281
 Melkart 105
 Memphis 13 n.1, 33, 39, 58, 60 n.5, 71, 86, 115, 127 n.1, 136, 140, 142, 145, 154, 158-161, 178, 182-184, 193, 194, 201, 202, 219, 220, 241, 242, 244-247, 276-279
 Menander 206
 Menas 160, 260
 Mendes, king 160, 260; town, 97 n. 2, 243
 Menelaus 175, 183; town, 201
 Menes 142, 158, 242, 172
 Menestheus 122
 Menkaurē' 189-192, 242, 247, 273
 Mentuemhet 200
 Mentuhotpe II 147, 282
 mercenaries 200, 202, 203, 206, 216
 Mernerē' 129
 Meroë 23 n.1, 128, 129, 138
 Mes, Inscription of 219-221, 224
 Mesopotamia 102 n.2, 237, 238
 Methyer 68
 Meton 157
 metrology 171-173, 284-290
 mice 52, 53
 milk 96, 254, 260, 261

- Min 55, 74, 75, 83, 84, 97, 106, 121
 mining 128, 129, 131, 138, 168
 Minotaur 182, 184
 Mneves 4, 272
 Mnevis 95, 242, 243, 246, 258
 Moeris 160-163, 260
 Momemphis 201, 202, 207, 208, 281
 monoliths 148, 149
 moon 55, 59, 66, 78, 79, 90; Isis, 7, 66
 Moses 261
 mourning 211, 212, 246, 261
 mulberry 132
 mummies 58, 93, 152, 153, 247, 253, 256, 257, 260, 262-267, 271, 272
 mummification, see embalming
 murder 228, 229
 Musaeus 275
 music 17, 60, 78, 79, 96 n.2
 Musonius Rufus 234
 Mut 76, 154, 258
 mutilation 181, 226, 230
 Mycenae 119-121
- Napata 128, 193
 Naqada cultures 55, 87, 90 n.3, 91, 249, 251
 Narmer 91, 142, 143, 256
 natron 201, 202, 265
 Naucratis 108, 191, 202, 207
 navigation 131
 Naxos 110
 Nebuchadrezzar 206
 Necho 130, 195, 200
 Nectanebo I 95
 Nectanebo II 94
 Nedyt 61
 Neferkarē' 56
 Nefertem 85, 86, 142
 Neferti, prophecy of, 165, 166
 Negative Confession 269, 270
 Neith 69, 121, 123
 Nekhbet 69
 Nencoreus 179
 Nephthys 60, 61, 72, 73, 83, 92, 95, 97, 269
 Nicanor 10
 Niciu 202
- Nile 19, 24, 33, 52, 53, 58, 60 n.5, 68, 76, 79, 85, 86, 97, 105, 128, 130, 131, 134, 135, 159, 160, 183, 186, 246, 276; inundation of, 18, 85, 86, 128, 135, 136, 138-141, 155, 158, 161, 268; mouths of, 130, 208; source of, 20, 86, 138, 140, 279; Blue Nile, 128, 141; White Nile, 140, 141
 Nileus 186
 Nilometer 136, 137
 Nilopolis 245, 246
 Nineveh 195
 Nitocris 143, 191, 192
 nomes 154, 167, 168, 197, 198, 212, 248, 251, 269
 Nubia 76, 138, 165, 168, 169, 171, 175, 203, 205
 Nun 68, 128
 Nut 15, 46, 60, 72, 76, 91, 105, 247
 Nysa 76, 77, 87, 115
- oaths 96, 225-227, 232
 obelisks 176, 180
 Ocean 20, 68
 Oceane, Oceanus 68
 Ocnus 279, 280
 Oenopides of Chios 140, 283
 olive 79, 104, 133
 "Opening of the Mouth" 209
 opium 281
 oracles 92, 220
 Orion 58, 59, 64
 Orpheus 97, 99-101, 208, 275, 280
 Orphics 65, 99-101, 117, 283
 Osiris 8, 17, 32, 51 n.3, 56-66, 68, 71-76, 78, 79, 81-83, 87-97, 106, 109, 110, 115-117, 125, 132, 136, 139, 145, 148, 149, 153, 159, 167, 173, 242, 244, 247, 251, 252, 254, 259, 260, 262, 264, 269, 270, 276, 278; tomb of, 14, 15, 95, 96, 204.
 Osor-Hapi 107
 Osor kon IV 194
 Osymandyas 3, 7, 25, 33, 148, 185, 186 n.3
 Ouchoreus 158
 Ovid 182, 204
 ox 247, 253, 258

- Palermo Stone 144
 Palestine 126, 207
 Pan 69, 83, 84, 106, 243, 258
 Pandion 125
 Panopolis 69, 84, 106
 panther-skin 65
 papyrus, papyri 138, 170, 174, 227,
 228, 238, 240, 241, 244, 246, 269,
 270
 paraschist 30, 264
 parricide 229
 Pathans 229
 Peisandros of Rhodes 104
 Peisistratus 228
 Pelops 119
 Pelusium 126, 176, 256
 Pentheus 61
 Pepi I 160
 Peripatetics 44, 45, 49 n.5, 67
 perjury 226
 perseia 132
 Persephone 74
 Perseus 105
 Persia 32, 111, 131, 143, 146, 175,
 180, 191, 207, 220, 238, 274
 Peser 227
 Petes, Peteus 122, 123
 phallicism 97, 98 n.2
 Phanes 65
 Phanodemos 11
 Pharos 86, 182
 Pherecydes of Syros 73, 81
 Pheron 27, 179
 Philae 64, 95, 205
 Philip of Macedon 137
 Philip III 88
 Philip Arrhidaeus 76
 Phoenicia 101, 117-119, 183, 207
 Photius 24
 Phrygia 102
 Piankhi 144, 193, 211, 276
 plague 108
 Plato 10, 11, 18, 44 n.2, 52, 53, 56,
 72, 86, 121, 122, 230, 275, 283
 Platonists 16, 36
 Pliny 28, 77, 79, 129, 130, 138, 142,
 179, 182, 191, 260
 Plutarch 7, 13 n.1, 14, 28, 59, 60,
 62, 64, 68, 89, 93, 96, 106, 110, 122,
 134, 142, 144, 211, 228, 260-262,
 277
 Pluto 106
 Polybius 36, 38, 44 n.2
 Polycrates 27, 274
 Pompey 39
 Pomponius Mela 130
 population of Egypt 4, 8, 122, 234
 Porphyry 8, 14 n.2, 23, 93, 262
 Poseidon 81, 124, 126
 Posidonius 16, 28 n.2, 36, 38, 48,
 50, 66
 post-stations 146
 Presocratics 45, 46
 Priam 103
 priests, Egyptian 6, 20, 30, 50, 52,
 65, 71 n.4, 86, 94-96, 107, 108, 116,
 121, 135, 152, 156, 188, 192, 209-
 211, 213-216, 219, 220, 222, 234,
 240, 242, 244, 245, 253, 254, 257,
 263, 270
 Proclus 11, 13, 20
 Procopius 205
 Prodicus 56
 Prometheus 9, 11, 12, 48, 72, 85, 86
 Proteus 26, 27, 182-184, 280
 Psammetichus 27, 52, 134, 191,
 194-196, 200-204, 230, 279
 Psammetichus II 274
 Psammis 27, 274
 Pseudo-Callisthenes 94
 Pseudo-Plutarch 54
 Ptah (see also Hephaestus) 39, 58,
 60 n.5, 67, 71, 85, 122, 127 n.1,
 142, 160, 161, 177, 185, 219, 226,
 242, 244, 245, 247, 281
 Ptolemy I 4, 8 n.1, 29, 30, 89, 107,
 138, 234, 275
 Ptolemy II 3, 19, 23, 88, 98 n.1,
 137, 138
 Ptolemy III 17, 88, 156
 Ptolemy VIII 145
 Ptolemy XI 33, 39, 143
 punishment 179, 211, 219, 225-233
 Punt 129
 purification 210
 Pygmalion 80, 81
 pyramids 26, 56, 73, 132, 145, 163,
 187-191, 196, 211, 268

- Pyramid Texts 57, 59-62, 83, 90, 91, 159, 247, 257, 258
 Pythagoras 13 n.1, 208, 273, 283
 Pythagoreans 140
- queens 112, 143, 147, 150
 quicksands 126
- Ra'djedef 27, 188
 rain-maker 178, 179
 ram 67, 70, 185, 243, 253, 258
 Ramesses I 184
 Ramesses II 85 n.5, 117, 148-151, 164, 165, 169, 173, 176, 177, 184-187, 216, 233
 Ramesses III 146, 169, 184, 219
 Ramesses IX 192
 Ramesses XI 215
 Ramesseum 146-154
 Rê' 55, 56, 59, 68 n.2, 69, 71, 78, 83, 94, 153, 242, 251
 red men 14, 204
 Red Sea 126, 130, 131, 165
 reed-dwellings 142
 Rekhmirê' 219, 224
 religion 33, 34, 54-64, 102, 135, 209; sky-religion, 55, 90
 Remphis 184-186
 residues, concept of, 30, 238, 239
 Rhampsinitus 177, 184, 185
 Rhea 60, 76
 rhinocerus 87
 Rhinocolura 181
 Rhodopis 191
 ritual 94, 96, 97, 135, 209-211, 244, 260
 robbers 189, 194, 212, 218, 227, 233
 Rodah 136, 137, 246
 Romans 17, 33, 156, 157, 159, 205, 234, 235, 257, 260, 267, 271, 288
- Sabaco, see Shabaka
 sacred writings 2, 144
 St. Jerome 42, 43
 Sahurê' 169, 190
 Sais 11, 69, 70, 121, 123, 144, 193-195, 200, 202, 247
 Samaria 170
 Sappho 191
- Saqqâra 59, 121, 132, 241, 261
 Sarapis 63, 64 n.1, 106, 107
 Sasychis 4, 273
 Satyrs 84, 85
 Satyrus 88
 scarab beetle 249
 schoenus 3 n.2, 161
 schools 217
 scorpion 261
 Scythia 77, 202
 seasons 67
 Sebennyts 247
 Sekmem 166
 Selene 66 n.2, 258
 Semele 102, 103
 Semiramis 175
 Semna 171
 Seneca 48, 50, 134
 Senwosret I 164-168, 174, 176-178, 180
 Senwosret II 175
 Senwosret III 164, 166, 168, 170, 171, 175, 176
 Septimius Severus 64
 Serapeum (canopus) 107; (Memphis) 107, 245, 271 n.1, 275
 serekh 91
 serpent 122-124, 184, 195, 255, 257
 servants 205, 214, 226
 sesame 133
 Sesoösis, Sesostris (see also Senwosret) 26, 27, 130, 163-179, 184, 185, 273, 274
 Sesoösis II 27
 Seth 13, 14 n.1, 55, 58, 60, 61, 72, 73, 90-92, 94, 97, 109, 110, 118, 134-136, 174, 204, 247, 252, 258-261, 264, 280; Seth-name, 56
 Sethos 27
 Setna Khaemwese 113, 266
 Setnakhte 184
 Sety I 226, 237
 Shabaka 27, 96, 180, 193-195
 shaft graves 119, 120
 sheep 136, 253, 254
 Shepseskaf 273
 Sherden 216
 Sheshonq 215, 273, 274
 ships 131, 168, 169, 176

- Shu 46, 79, 80, 85, 105, 243
 Sidon 206
 Silenus 85
 silver 84, 129, 176
 Sinai 76, 166, 202
 Sinuhe 84, 166, 169, 170, 176, 177
 Sirius, see Sothis
 Siut 241, 254, 255, 259
 slaves 214, 235
 sledge 178, 187, 253
 Smendes 192
 snake, see serpent
 Snofru 189
 Sobek 109, 134, 201, 243, 259
 social customs 30, 33, 34
 Socrates 139
 Sokaris 58
 Solomon 105
 Solon 13 n.1, 86, 208, 228, 233
 Sophists 56
 Sothis 58, 64, 65, 85, 154-156, 265
 speech, origin of 49, 51
 Sphinx 191, 192
 spontaneous generation 46, 47 n.1, 52, 53
 stars 45, 65
 statues 148-151, 161, 163, 170, 171, 177, 178, 183-185, 203, 271 n.1, 275, 284-290
 status of women 112, 114
 Stephanus Byzantinus 8, 277
 Stoics 16, 36, 37, 44, 48, 49, 53, 56, 67
 stone 144, 148, 149, 174, 187-190
 Strabo 14, 21-25, 79, 82, 86, 88, 128, 130, 136, 147, 161, 162, 167, 175, 181, 190, 197-199, 201, 202, 242, 243, 245, 256, 273, 275, 277
 Sudan 76, 129, 205
 suicide 178
 Suidas 123, 279
 sun 55, 56, 59, 66, 78, 90, 242, 243, 256, 259, 283; Osiris, 7, 59, 66
 syncretism 106
 Syria 102 n.2, 118, 169, 177, 202, 207
 Tale of Two Brothers 97, 103
 Tanais, river 170
 Tanis 192, 193, 215, 256
 Tanwetamani 195, 200
 Tauromenion 41 n.1, 44
 taxation 214, 216, 221, 228, 232
 Tefnakhte, see Tnephachthus
 Tefnut 243
 Telecles 284, 288
 temple-healing 107, 108
 temples 39, 64, 76, 94, 95, 107, 108, 110, 115, 116, 127 n.1, 135, 146, 148-154, 160, 161, 173, 177, 181, 183, 185, 196, 199, 209, 210, 213, 214, 244, 246, 247, 274, 281, 282; wealth of, 94, 95, 146, 147, 212-214
 Thales 20, 138, 139, 241
 Thebes (Egyptian) 8, 10, 30, 34, 54, 67, 68, 75, 76, 79, 80, 87, 101, 102, 122, 126-128, 145, 154, 158, 166, 176, 184, 192, 193, 200, 210, 215, 219, 220, 222, 245, 255, 258, 269, 279, 281; (Greek) 101, 102, 104, 118
 Theocritus 8 n.1
 Theodorus 284, 288
 Theophrastus 44 n.2, 79, 82, 132, 133, 141, 235
 Theopompus 11, 137
 Thessaly 125
 Thonis 86
 Thoth (see also Hermes) 17, 66 n.2, 69, 77-79, 86 n.1, 90, 241, 251, 256, 270, 272, 276
 Thrace 88, 98-100, 124-126, 183, 273
 Thrasios 80, 81
 Thucydides 35, 137
 Thutmose III 87, 96 n.3, 176, 179, 219, 282
 Thutmose IV 108, 192
 Timaeus of Tauromenion 38
 Timotheus 106, 116
 Tiryns 103
 Titans 103, 109
 Tnephachthus 144, 145, 193, 194
 tombs 132, 135, 147, 154, 159, 189, 196, 212, 247, 262
 tree worship 55, 249
 tribunal of gods 90, 91, 268-270
 Triptolemus 74, 124

- Troglodytes 126
 Trojan War 39, 40, 98
 Troy 103, 175, 183, 186; (Egyptian)
 174
 Turin Canon 71, 144, 188, 190, 242
 turquoise 76
 Tutankhamūn 191
 Typhon, see Seth
 Tyre 105, 183, 206
 Tzetzes 9, 50, 96

 uraeus 184
 urine 179
 Utit 255, 256

 Vedic Hymns 53
 Vergil 182
 vine 10, 17, 77
 Vitruvius 9, 50, 289
 vizir 184, 218-220, 222-224
 Vulcanus 72
 vulture 69, 185, 249, 258

 Wadi Tumilat 130, 176
 Walls of the Prince 166, 176
 water, primordial, see also Nun 128,
 138, 142
 wax figures 93, 94, 134 n.1, 204 n.2
 Wepwawet 83, 242, 251, 254, 259
 wigs 240
 wine 77, 84, 133
 wolf 57 n.7, 83, 254, 259
 wood 144, 176, 247
 Wosret 166
 wrestling 17, 79
 writing 77, 78

 Xenagoras 10, 31
 Xenophon 137
 Xerxes 143

 Zalmoxis 10, 273
 Zeno 44 n.2
 Zeus 67, 68, 71, 72, 76, 81, 101, 102,
 106, 109, 118, 147, 154, 248, 282
 zodiac 238
 zones 140
 zoogony 33, 46, 47
 zoolatry 30, 54, 248-254
 Zoroaster 272
 Zosimos 133